THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER;

OR,

UNITARIAN

MAGAZINE AND REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XVIII.

FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1862.

LONDON:
EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178, STRAND.

1862.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/christian-reformer_1862-01_18_205

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCV.] JANUARY, 1862. [Vol. XVIII.

SOME ACCOUNT OF MR. RICHARD FRANKLAND, THE EMINENT NONCONFORMIST TUTOR.

The year on which we are entering brings round the anniversary of some legislative and other acts of two centuries ago, which, for evil or for good, have left their mark on the constitution and the history of England.

It was on the 22nd day of February, 1662, that the Parliament (then in the second year of its existence) assembled, which Lord Macaulay describes as "the most loyal that had ever met in England." Its "eighteen years of misgovernment" began with a cruel Act designed to extirpate Quakerism.* That was presently followed by the Act of Uniformity (14 Car. II. c. iv.); and as a proper pendant to these Acts, there followed one putting the licencer's screw on the press (14 Car. II. c. xxxiii.). The Quakers have long enjoyed unmolested the right of public worship. The press now has all the freedom that just men and good citizens desire. But the Act of Uniformity, one of political and religious vengeance, still does discredit to our statute-book. Two Thousand men of learning and character, on the day when it came into force, recorded by a highminded act of self-denial their solemn protest against it.

We propose in the present volume of the Christian Reformer to attempt to do justice to the courage and honesty of these confessors, in a series of biographical and historical sketches.

Mr. John D'Israeli, in an essay entitled, "Political Religionism," asserted, when speaking of the clergy ejected by the Act of Uniformity, "Their history is not glorious, and their heroes are obscure." A better acquaintance† with the subject would have taught the author of "Curiosities of Literature" that the history of Nonconformity is in a moral and religious point of view most honourable, and that "obscure" is the last epithet to be attached to such names as Baxter, Howe, Owen, Bates, Manton and Oliver Heywood. As we do not profess to take

* 14 Car. II. c. i. provided that for every act of public worship Quakers should be fined five pounds, and for the third offence they were to be transported.

† How slight was the elder D'Israeli's acquaintance with Nonconformist biography appears from his naming Samuel Chandler as one of the ejected clergy. That worthy divine was not born till after the Revolution. English writers sometimes strangely blunder when they venture an allusion to religious literature; thus, in his Life of Pitt, the Earl of Stanhope confounds George Fox the Quaker with John Fox, the author of "Acts and Monuments."

3024

the subjects of our intended series according to any graduated intellectual or religious scale of our own, our selection of RICHARD FRANKLAND as the subject of the first essay need not be construed into a design to place him higher among the early Nonconformists of England than the facts now to be stated shall justify. No one acquainted with the history of this useful, conscientious and fearless man, will dispute his title to a respectable position amongst the worthies of the seventeenth century.

Richard Frankland was born in the year 1630, in Craven, a part of Yorkshire then and long after (according to Mrs. Cappe's description) insulated from the rest of England by steep hills and impassable roads. Now the traveller on the railroad which connects Leeds and Lancaster, passes within a mile or two of Rathmel (the place of Frankland's birth) as he approaches from the west the Settle station. It is a very small village in the parish of Giggleswick. Of his parentage nothing is known; but we may surmise from the family estate which in the course of time descended to him, that his father was one of the Craven *statesmen*, as the proprietors of freehold land then were called.

Giggleswick was fortunate in possessing a grammar-school, even then, according to Dr. Calamy, "famous," which had been founded and well endowed by Edward VI. with land which had belonged to the dissolved monastery of Nether Acaster. The constitution of the school is popular, being governed by the vicar and seven inhabitants elected by the freeholders. It was the school of William Paley, whose father was its master for nearly half a century. Connected with it are scholarships at Christ's College, Cambridge. Possibly one of these valuable aids to poor scholars may have been enjoyed by Richard Frankland, who, when seventeen years of age, proceeded to the University and was entered a student in that College.

Christ's College, founded by Margaret, Countess of Derby and mother of Henry VII., had from its foundation scholarships open to natives of nine counties, of which Yorkshire was one. The scholars were to be chosen from youths "virtuous, apt and distinguished, of tried talent and hopeful, not Bachelors of Arts nor in holy orders, who can speak the Latin tongue and understand it when spoken, who propose to themselves the study of the liberal sciences and theology, and who propose to seek the priesthood, *idoneique ad minus ad legendam sophistriam.*" In addition to the foundation scholars, there were scholarships founded by a clergyman of the name of Carr, open to natives of the parish of Giggleswick, selected by the trustees and master of the grammar-school and the churchwardens. That Richard Frankland* enjoyed

* At another College in the University of Cambridge, that of St. Catherine Hall, there is a *Frankland Fellowship*, founded by Samuel Frankland, a learned and ancient schoolmaster of Coventry. It is not, however, probable, that Richard Frankland was descended from the Coventry schoolmaster.

one of these scholarships, we suggest as probable, but have no evidence of the fact.

At Christ's Church Milton had studied, and graduated only fifteen years earlier. But the College was no longer under the rule of Dr. Thomas Bainbrigge (the *durus magister* of Milton's Latin elegy). He had been removed to make way for a master of a more Puritan stamp, Dr. Samuel Bolton, one of the twenty-seven students of Christ's Church who graduated M.A. together with Milton in 1632. This College was in the seventeenth century inferior only to Trinity and St. John's in the number of its resident students. It had been the College of Latimer, Leland, Harington, Sir Philip Sydney and Joseph Mede. During Richard Frankland's time, the great light of Christ's Church was the celebrated Platonist, Dr. Henry More. There entered in the same year as Frankland, John Howe, the eminent Nonconformist divine, who, during his two years' residence there, is supposed to have imbibed something of the spirit of those eminent Christian philosophers, Cudworth, More and John Smith. A student entered Trinity College the same year that Frankland entered Christ's Church, with whom he afterwards contracted a warm and enduring friendship, Oliver Heywood. There were some parallel facts in their lives. Both were born in the same year and in the same county, both entered the same University in the same year, both professed to owe their spiritual life to the same preacher, both were ejected by the Act of Uniformity, and both were regarded as among the brightest lights of Nonconformity in the north of England.

It is not easy for us, who enjoy the fruits of an advanced civilization, with its daily postal communication to every remote village in the land, with newspapers conveying to us once or twice a day the intelligence of the world, to realize the seclusion and quiet of a Craven village in the seventeenth century, where two or three clergymen and a few of the larger landed proprietors would constitute the available good society in the whole district. For news, the inhabitants of Giggleswick would have to trust to the occasional manuscript news-letter received by the nearest wealthy proprietor who could afford to indulge in that rare luxury, or to the little quaint quarto pamphlets and broadsides occasionally conveyed in the pack of some adventurous pedlar. Great must have been the change of life of which an intelligent Yorkshire lad must have been conscious, when, emerging from the intellectual twilight of a remote village, he found himself surrounded by the blaze of light afforded by an University. If in his walks along the reedy banks of the Cam, his eye grew wearied with the tame level of the scenery, unbroken by a distant hill, and he sighed for the romantic beauty of his native hills, he would feel the compensation of the varied and cultivated society to which he now belonged, and would listen with wondering ad-

miration to the discourses of the gifted men whom it was his privilege to hear in the hall of his College or the pulpit of the University.

Cambridge was visited by the plague during the very year that Frankland and Howe entered the University. Early in September, the gates of Jesus College were shut,* in consequence of the prevalence of the infection in the town. To students situated like Frankland at a distance of two hundred miles from home, in those days of impassable roads, the plague was a sore visitation.† It does not follow from the closing of the gates that the students even of Jesus College were all dispersed. Dr. Worthington's Diary records, amid deaths from the plague here and there, his own preaching in the College chapel and at St. Mary's.

Calamy tells us that Frankland made good proficiency at the University both in divine and human learning. The preacher who most attracted his regard was Mr. Samuel Hammond (afterwards ejected from a lectureship at St. Nicholas's, Newcastle), who was a Fellow of Magdalen College. Of him it is recorded by Calamy that "he began to preach in the neighbouring church of St. Giles with that pious zeal, pungency and Christian experience, that from all parts of the town, and from the most distant colleges, his useful ministry was attended on." Scores, nay hundreds, of persons, it is said, owed to him their deepest impressions of religion, and his reputation as a preacher equalled that which the noted Calvinistic divine, William Perkins, had previously won in the same place. Mr. Hammond's evangelical eloquence was the torch that lighted up the pure flame of religion in the heart of Oliver Heywood. As the latter speaks, in connection with the religious services he attended at St. Giles's, of "the ingenious and gracious scholars with whom he had intimate familiarity," and by whom his religious convictions were strengthened, we may well suppose that Frankland and Heywood were not only fellow-worshipers, but from an early period confidential friends.

While Howe, after taking his first degree at Cambridge, removed to Oxford, Frankland remained in the alma mater of his original choice, and, as he took his Master's degree, probably remained in Christ's Church the full academic period. Those who desire to read a minute account of Cambridge studies in the seventeenth century, may gratify their curiosity by turning to Mr. Masson's elaborate Life of Milton (Vol. I. pp. 87—274).

Howe gave himself zealously to the philosophical studies of the University, and there imbibed the "Platonic tincture" which pervades his published works. Oliver Heywood, on the other

* Mr. Rogers, in his excellent Life of Howe, does not notice this fact, but it is recorded in Dr. John Worthington's Diary, published by the Chetham Society.

† Milton and Newton also were troubled during their residence at Cambridge by the breaking out of the plague in the town.

hand, though too wise to despise philosophy, gave his mind to Perkins, Bolton and other Puritan authorities, rather than to Aristotle and Plato. It is probable from his subsequent career, and from the distinction which he acquired as a teacher, that Mr. Frankland, combining the tastes of both these eminent men, studied with great, if not equal, ardour both philosophy and practical divinity.

The after life of Mr. Frankland gives satisfactory proof that in youth he made a faithful use of his intellectual advantages. He then laid the firm foundations on which his after academic reputation was built, for he had afterwards but few opportunities of frequenting libraries or consorting with learned men. Of him, as of the village preacher of the poet, it might, with the exception of one or two brief periods, be truly said,

"Remote from towns he ran his godly race."

On leaving the University, he appears for a time to have led the unsettled and somewhat anxious life which often awaited the young levite; now helping some aged minister, now doing duty as a domestic chaplain. The date of his ordination, as given by Calamy, is Sept. 14, 1653, when he would be twenty-three years of age. But we learn from the same authority that he had previously preached by invitation at Hexham, in Northumberland, and also at two churches in the county of Durham, Lanchester and Houghton-le-Spring. The latter was the scene, in the previous century, of the Christian works and virtues of Bernard Gilpin, to whom the town owes its grammar-school. Under the Presbyterian discipline, it was not unusual for candidates for the ministry to exercise their gifts as preachers for some time before ordination. The episcopal form of church government was overthrown, and Richard Frankland received ordination, not at the hands of a bishop, but from several ministers who had in some northern part of the kingdom formed themselves into a presbytery, and supplied a rude and very imperfect ecclesiastical government, recognized to some extent by the law of the land, but not generally strengthened by popular support. Of the validity of his ordination he entertained no doubt, either then or at a later period when compelled in very altered circumstances anxiously to review his course. Recognizing in the Church no higher authority, under Christ its head, than that of a faithful and accepted minister, he did not hesitate to receive the orders which were conferred by a body of such men united together for general ecclesiastical purposes.

The changes and anxieties of our young levite did not end at his ordination. Finding his position at Lanchester discouraging, he undertook the office of private chaplain or tutor in the family of Alderman Brook, at Ellenthorp, in the diocese of York, where he was able to continue the public offices of the ministry, there being a Presbyterian foundation in that place, one of the very

few (probably not exceeding five) which trace back their origin to the Commonwealth times. His next change was to Stockton-ward, in the county of Durham, where he became the assistant or curate of Mr. Lupthern, rector of Sedgefield.

Among the principal gentlemen in the county was Sir Arthur Haslerigg, the noted republican, who was known among the loyal party by the *soubriquet* of the "Bishop of Durham," that title being given him in consequence of his large acquisition by purchase of Bishops' and Church lands. He was one of the five members whom Charles had so madly sought to arrest in Parliament itself; and though he sometimes vigorously opposed the Protector, and was for a short period one of the excluded, yet he regained Cromwell's confidence, and was included in the list of the Protector's Lords, but declined the doubtful honour. To this remarkable man Richard Frankland owed the only preferment which for a short time he enjoyed, namely, the living of St. Andrew's * Auckland. The village is situated on the river Gaunless. The church is a large Gothic building, and has a nave and side aisles, a transept and a chancel, over which, towards the west, a tower rises. The incumbents, though bearing no higher title than curates, are well provided for. There was much stirring in Richard Frankland's incumbency. His patron had received a grant of the Castle at Bishop Auckland, and he, little anticipating the coming changes which would hurl the fortunes of his family to the ground, raised out of the ruins of the Castle a magnificent mansion, to the hospitalities of which the godly incumbent of St. Andrew's was doubtless an invited guest. The mansion shared the fate of the fortunes of the house of Haslerigg. Bishop Cosins, on taking possession soon after the Restoration, denounced it as the "habitation of fanaticism;" and refusing its shelter, pulled it down and erected in its place the elegant chapel which continues to the present day.

St. Andrew's Auckland was distant but eleven miles from the city of Durham. Hither the eyes of Richard Frankland were turned with interest and hope, when the strong public opinion in favour of a northern seat of academic learning pointed the attention of the Protector to it as a desirable site for a college. The alienation from the episcopal Church of the Deanery and other cathedral houses at Durham, furnished the means of carrying the public wish into effect. In common with all the better men of his religious party, Cromwell was an earnest friend of education. As early as 1650, he had declared in favour of an University at Durham, alleging that it might, by God's blessing,

* The late Rev. Joseph Hunter has (Life of O. Heywood, p. 242) confounded this living with that of Bishop Auckland. St. Andrew's lies about a mile distant south of Bishop Auckland. In Ross and Mackenzie's County History, the name of Richard Frankland is given, with the ominous addition of "intruder," but the year of his "intrusion" is not specified.

conduce to promoting learning and piety in those poor, rude and ignorant parts, and that the place was pleasant and apt, the air healthful and provisions plentiful.

But six years elapsed before the plan was ripe for action; and finally, in 1657, the Protector issued a patent of endowment, appropriating certain Church lands, the Castle and some of the cathedral buildings, to the use of a College at Durham. Able professors were appointed, and visitors, gifted with large powers, were named from among the principal gentry in the interest of Parliament in the northern counties. Among the appointments we find the well-known Presbyterian names of Samuel Hammond, Edward Bowles, William Durant and Richard Gilpin. To Richard Frankland the office of Tutor was assigned.* The new University had its difficulties and its opponents. Oxford and Cambridge petitioned against their new sister, and protested against her being enabled to grant degrees. There were opponents of another class—men of enthusiastic notions like William Dell, William Erbury and George Fox—who, trusting exclusively to the operations of the Holy Spirit or the appeal to the inner light, distrusted all material arrangements and aids in making men ministers of Christ's gospel. Fox visited the College at Durham in 1657, and reasoned with one of the masters, whom he describes as "a man come from London to set up a College to make ministers of Christ, as they said." The good Quaker argued, "that to teach men Hebrew, Greek, Latin and the seven arts, which were all but the teachings of the natural man, was not the way to make them ministers of Christ. For the languages began at Babel; and to the Greeks, that spoke Greek as their mother tongue, the preaching of the cross of Christ was foolishness; and to the Jews, that spoke Hebrew as their mother tongue, Christ was a stumbling-block." With fanatical talk like this the leathern-girded Friend continued to assail University learning. He imagined in his simplicity that he had converted the Durham Professor. Possibly "the man from London" surmised that the worthy man who talked with him was a little out of his wits. At all events, he bore very patiently the Quaker's rebuffs, and, as the latter states, before the interview closed, "became very loving and tender." Such was not commonly the issue of the passages at arms which were at those days not uncommon in churches and chapels, and afterwards in prisons, between the Presbyterians and the disciples of Fox. We may, however, decline to accept Fox's statement that the Professor, in consideration of his arguments, "declined to set up his College."†

* In the documents connected with the establishment of the College at Durham, printed by Peck, Mr. Frankland's name is not mentioned; but in Samuel Wesley's "Reply" to "Palmer's Vindication," it is said that he was "Oliver's Vice-chancellor-elect at Durham" (p. 34).

† George Fox's Journal, II. 450 (5th ed., 8vo).

There were weightier hindrances than the idle puffs of the Quaker spirit.

The death of Cromwell, following so soon after the establishment of the College, was the blow which destroyed it. The feeble hands of Richard Cromwell, notwithstanding many flattering words from the Provost and Fellows of the new establishment, were not able to place it on a firm foundation. It had a feeble existence between life and death, till the Restoration came and brought changes not confined to the Cathedral close and Castle of Durham.*

Mr. Frankland probably owed his appointment to a Tutorship in the new University to the influence of his patron, whose name appears in connection with the scheme in the Commons' Journals, VI. 589.

Mr. Carlyle says that the College actually got to work, and "began giving lessons of human grammar, human geography, geometry and other divine knowledge, to the vacant human mind in those once sleepy edifices, dark heretofore or illuminated mainly by Dr. Cosins's papistical wax-lights or the like." (Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, II. 263.)

If Mr. Frankland had gone into Durham to reside (which is doubtful), he sought to forget his disappointment there by returning to his duties at St. Andrew's Auckland with renewed vigour. He was no listless and indifferent labourer in his Master's vineyard. In addition to the duties ordinarily performed by the clergy in those days, he gave his people each Sunday morning before the sermon an exposition of scripture, preached in the afternoon, catechized the young, and, not satisfied with any memoriter work on their part, endeavoured by familiar conversation to instil into their minds the principles and precepts of religion. His pastoral instruction was conveyed in an amiable and pleasing manner, and was enforced by the virtues of his daily life. His ministerial success was great; but it did not, when the tide in public affairs ebbed, save him from annoyance. Evil men, shrewdly prognosticating coming events, and feeling, even where they had professed it, no real regard for their zealous minister, hastened to assail him. An attorney named Bowster plotted with one Marthwaite, a clergyman of broken reputation, to do him wrong. The man of law publicly demanded from Mr. Frankland, even before the first persecuting Act was passed, whether he intended to conform. The minister so questioned quietly rebuked the impertinence by saying he hoped it was soon enough to answer that question when the King and Parliament had determined what conformity they would require. Then the man of law threatened him, if he refused to answer, that he should

* Our readers will find a sketch of the brief history of the Durham University in C. R., II. 290, 291, from the pen of Mr. James Yates. See also Carlyle's Letters of Cromwell.

be turned out of his place. Mr. Frankland replied that the King's proclamation for quiet possession would, he hoped, secure him from violence. Then the lawyer and his parson associate got possession of the keys of the church, and, setting Mr. Frankland at defiance, prevented his performing duty. The neighbouring magistrates were appealed to; they admitted the wrong, but declined to aid him to a legal remedy. He could do nothing less than prefer an indictment against his troublers for a riot and assault. A true bill was found, but the case was removed by the defendants to the assizes. Mr. Frankland was doomed to experience not only the delay but the uncertainty of the law; a slight flaw in the indictment saved the defendants. The pious divine was felt to be on the losing, as his rude assailants were on the winning side; his counsel did little for him, and so the matter ended.

When the Act of Uniformity passed, and it was necessary for the minister of St. Andrew's Auckland to determine on his future course, the new Bishop, Dr. Cosins, in a spirit very different from that of the violent men just named, pressed him to conform and receive episcopal ordination, assuring him, in that case, that, besides retaining his living there, he should receive further preferment. Mr. Frankland pleaded his reliance on the ordination he had received from presbyters, and the impossibility of his going through a new form of ordination. This objection was strongly felt by several of the Presbyterian clergy of 1662. His college friend, John Howe, when asked by Bishop Seth Ward to mention any one of his reasons against conformity, at once specified re-ordination. "Pray, Sir," said the Bishop, "what *hurt* is there in being twice ordained?" "*Hurt*, my Lord," rejoined Howe; "it *hurts* my understanding; the thought is shocking; it is an absurdity, since nothing can have two beginnings. I am sure I am a minister of Christ, and am ready to debate that matter with your Lordship if your Lordship pleases; but I cannot begin again to be a minister."*

The diocesan with whom Frankland had to argue his case tried to dissuade him from his scruple. Failing in this, he tempted him by offering to modify his conformity on the point of re-ordination by a private service, unknown to his people, and by giving a conditional character to the ceremony by the use of such words as these—"If thou hast not been ordained, I ordain thee!" Mr. Frankland knew the moral law too well to be persuaded to do that in private which he regarded as wrong if done publicly. His conviction was too clear and positive to justify his submitting to a hypothetical ordination. He was properly grateful to Bishop Cosins for his considerate kindness, and, taking a respectful leave, assured him that it was not temper but conscience that

* Rogers' Life of John Howe, p. 152.

forbad his conformity. The transaction was creditable to the good feeling of the Bishop, and in every way honourable to Mr. Frankland, illustrating the delicacy and strength of his moral sense, and the high estimation in which his ministerial abilities and personal character were regarded by others.

The moderation of Dr. John Cosins in his intercourse with Frankland is the more commendable, when it is remembered that he had been a considerable sufferer in the Commonwealth times, censured by Parliament, ejected from the Mastership of Peterhouse, Cambridge, and compelled for many years to reside in France. Neal speaks of him as "a zealous enemy of the Presbyterians." But we must remember the fact (also recorded by Neal) that his dying thoughts were those of charity and peace. "I take it to be my duty" (such is the sentiment recorded in his will), "and that of all the bishops and ministers of the Church, to do our utmost endeavour, that at last an end may be put to the differences of religion, or at least that they may be lessened."

The kindly feelings of the Bishop towards Mr. Frankland were afterwards disturbed by an incident which Calamy records. The Bishop preached a sermon from the words (1 Cor. xiv. last verse), "Let all things be done decently and in order." Mr. Frankland soon after, on the invitation of a brother minister, preached from the words in the context, "Let all things be done to edification." The Bishop resented the sermon as a designed affront; but a justice of the peace, who had been one of Mr. Frankland's hearers, acted as mediator, and assured the Bishop that the sermon was such as an orthodox divine should preach, and contained nothing hostile to the doctrine of the Church.

When the great crisis in his public life arrived, and Mr. Frankland found himself ejected from the Church in which he would willingly have continued to minister, could he have done so with a true and loyal conscience, he retired to Rathmel. In one respect his lot was less painful than that of most of the ejected clergy; poverty did not stare him in the face, as he had a small patrimonial estate. But to a man of active habits and decided character, the want of occupation is a severe trial. We do not know how the early years of his enforced silence were passed. At first the ejected minister of St. Andrew's might share the expectation of a speedy comprehension, and it was the policy of the Court from time to time to fan this delusive hope. He might also, as opportunity served, quietly minister among those of his neighbours in the Palatinate who hungered and thirsted for the religious instruction which the ejected had supplied to their hearts' content. We have, in the Letters of Dr. Granville, the Dean of Durham (just published by the Surtees Society), a curious picture of the ill condition of the diocese after the Restoration. The Church was opposed on the one side by the

Puritan, and on the other by the Popish party. In many parishes (we take the quotation from the Saturday Review), "masses were openly and publiquely said, and warning given to the people to come thereto." In other places, "*the churches were altogether unprovided of ministers,* and the fabrics altogether ruinous and in great decay. *There be neyther Bibles, Books of Common Prayer, surplisses, fonts, communion tables, nor anything that is necessarie for the service of God.*" Dr. Cosins did his best to supply the wants of his diocese; but generally speaking the hierarchy were more intent on driving out Nonconformists, than careful to supply the spiritual wants of those who conformed. The spiritual destitution of the Palatinate of Durham, between the Restoration and the Revolution, is the more remarkable as that county was, according to Calamy's account, less affected by Nonconformity than many others. The total number of those ejected between 1660 and 1662 was but thirty-two, and of these twelve subsequently conformed. Few men of note are mentioned besides Frankland and Pell. Calamy had, it is evident, not many sources of information relating to this distant part of the county, and it is probable that the names of some of the ejected in Durham, as in other counties, are altogether lost.

It was more than five years after his retirement from St. Andrew's Auckland before Mr. Frankland began anew his career as an instructor of youth and a theological tutor. In Dr. Calamy's narrative of his life, it is said that "he was persuaded to set up a private academy in his own house, and that Sir Thomas Liddal sent his son George to be educated under him."

The list of pupils at Rathmel is headed by "George Lyddell, March 8, 1669," who was the fifth and youngest son of Sir Thos. Liddell,* of Ravensworth Castle, in the county of Durham. It may occasion surprise that the head of the loyal house of Ravensworth should thus appear as the personal friend of a Nonconformist minister and the prompter of a Nonconformist academy. But Sir Thomas Liddell (the second baronet) had married Anne, daughter of Sir Harry Vane the elder, and the family history at this period has other tokens of a strong Nonconformist bias. Thus Robert, an elder brother of Mr. Frankland's first pupil, married into the family of William Kiffin, the eminent Nonconformist merchant of London, and, dying young, was buried in the Dissenters' ground at Bunhill Fields.

For nearly thirty years Mr. Frankland continued to perform the laborious but honourable duties of an instructor of youth. From the first he received and instructed young men for the ministry, and thus takes his place at the head of a long roll of names, among which the most conspicuous after his own are Samuel

* Thus we have three modes of spelling the same name, a warning against the dogmatism of those that suppose that there is one only right way of designating names in the seventeenth century.

Jones, Grove, Latham, Doddridge, Aikin, Priestley, Enfield, Belsham and Wellbeloved. Samuel Wesley speaks, but not with perfect accuracy, of the academy at Rathmel as being *the first* of the Nonconformist academies in England and the model of all the rest.

To the early Nonconformist tutors especial honour is due. They cast their seed on the waters under a threatening sky, not knowing but that the fruit of their toil would be at once destroyed by the storm of persecution. A Nonconformist with a Master's degree from one of the Universities was in those times taunted with a twofold crime,—first, that of interfering with the Royal prerogative, and next, with a violation of the oath by which Masters of Arts undertook not to perform their readings as in an University anywhere but at Oxford and Cambridge. This oath* had grown out of an attempt at an early period to draw off students to Stamford and Northampton. The oath was interpreted as relating only to those exercises which preceded the conferring degrees. It was, however, in some instances, a trouble to the sensitive conscience of the early Nonconformists. Mr. Frankland's neighbour, Mr. William Pell, the ejected minister of Great Stainton, when at Newcastle, declined compliance, on the ground of his University oath, with the solicitation of his friends to teach University learning.

Nonconformist tutors in the seventeenth century also entered on their work with the prospect of concentrating against their dwellings and persons the worst spite of every neighbouring parson whose hatred of schism was stronger than his goodnature:

> "Unasked their pains, ungrateful their advice,
> Starving their gain, and martyrdom their price."

Mr. Frankland was eminently successful as a tutor. The biographers of his pupils never mention his name save with honour. Dr. James Clegg, one of the later generation, and one of the last survivors of his pupils, thus describes both the tutor and the academic discipline at Rathmel in his account of Mr. John Ashe:

"The Rev. Mr. Frankland, M.A., had then under his conduct the most numerous and flourishing private academy in England, and he was indeed, by great learning, wisdom and an admirable temper, excellently qualified for that post and service. In the space of a few years he had to the number of 300 and upwards under his tuition,—some of them intended for the law, some for physic, but most of them for the ministry of the gospel; and I never knew a tutor so entirely beloved by them all, nor one that so well deserved it. His unaffected gravity, sweetened with candour, meekness and humility, procured him that esteem and veneration even from the most licentious, that made them ever afraid of grieving or offending him."

---

* The subject was largely discussed in the controversy (1704—1707) between Samuel Palmer and Samuel Wesley respecting Nonconformist academies, and the learning, loyalty and morals of Dissenters.

Of the discipline at the academy, Dr. Clegg gives this account:

"The whole family was called to prayer exactly at seven in the morning, summer and winter. About an hour after breakfast, the several classes, according to their seniority, were called into the lecture-room, and the tutor and his assistant continued reading lectures to them till noon. After dinner, the students that minded their business retired to their closets till six at night, and were then called to prayers. After supper, the most diligent and studious met eight or ten in a chamber, to confer about their reading, and any difficulties they had met with in it, and one of them prayed before they parted. On Thursdays, the students exhibited theses on such subjects as were given them, and disputed in public on such questions as the tutor appointed. On that night, after supper, they had often disputations in their chambers on such questions as they agreed to debate. On Saturdays, before the evening prayers, one read in public what was called an analysis or methodical and critical dissertation on some verses of a Psalm, or some chapter of the New Testament; but this was not expected from any in their first years. After supper, on that night, they met in their chambers to confer on some practical subject, and concluded with prayer, which each performed in his turn, but only one of a night."

This is probably the period at which to introduce a very remarkable incident in the life of Mr. Frankland, and which serves to set forth his moral courage and patriotism. We give the story as found in Thoresby's transcript of Dr. Henry Sampson's (also one of the ejected clergy, respecting whom we may have more to say hereafter) Day-book (additional MSS., British Museum, No. 4460, p. 28):

"*Mr. Frankland's the N. C. minister his going to King Charles II.*

"Himself told me that he had a violent impulse upon his mind to go to the King; that he could neither study nor do anything else for several days; that he took up a resolution that he would go to him. He acquainted some with it, who spent some time in prayer, as himself also did at other times. He wrote down what he intended to say to him, thinking it too adventurous to speak to a King extempore, or what presence of mind he might then have; so he goes to the old Earl of Manchester, Lord Chamberleyne, who used him very friendly, and desired him that he would bring him to speak to the King. The Earl would fain have known what he would say to him, but he would not tell him. The Earl appoints him a place to stand at, which the King was to passe by to the Councell. When the King came out, 'That's the man,' said the Earle, 'would speak to your Majesty.' The King asked him, 'Would you speak with me?' 'Yes,' saith he, 'but in private.' So the King stept aside from the nobility that followed. Then said Mr. Frankland, 'The Eternall God, whose I am and whom I serve, commands you to reform your life, your family, your kingdom and the Church; if you do not, there are such judgments of God impending (at which words he grew pale and chang'd countenance) that wil destroy both you and the kingdome.' 'I wil,' saith the King, 'do what I can.' Mr. Fr. repeated this later part and added, 'I know the wrath of a King is as the roaring of a lyon; but for the sake of your soul I have taken up this speech, and leave it with you.' The King hasted away, saying,

'I thank you, Sir;' and twice looking back before he went into the counsel-chamber, said, 'I thank you, Sir,—I thank you.' But he said and did not."

The "old Earl of Manchester" who was the means of obtaining for Mr. Frankland the audience, was one of the more moderate of the Presbyterian party, who had a considerable hand in the Restoration, on account of which his former political transgressions were forgiven, and he received in 1660 the office of Lord Chamberlain. He performed the duties of that office (according to Clarendon) so well, that he retained it till his death, May 5, 1671. It was probably not long before this date that Frankland adventured to cross the lion's path, and, notwithstanding his boldness, retired unhurt. The anecdote helps us to understand of what kind of stuff the ejected ministers were made in respect to delicacy of conscience and strength of nerve. Charles too seldom in the precincts of his Court encountered either in man or woman fearless truth and honour; on this occasion he exhibited a momentary moral sense by thanking the blunt reprover of his vices.

It was just as the Rathmel Academy began to flourish that he was troubled by harassing law proceedings issuing from the spiritual courts. He was again and again cited and prosecuted, and at last excommunicated. These proceedings of necessity injured his worldly prospects, and occasioned him much expense in frequent removals, in order that he might put himself out of the reach of the local court in which the proceedings originated. His first removal was into the neighbouring county of Westmoreland, where he found, in the spring of 1674, a convenient place of retreat in the quiet village of Natland, about a mile from Kendal. Here the ancient chapel had fallen into ruin; and as there was no endowment, there was no resident clergyman,—a circumstance which perhaps secured him a longer period of quiet than he was permitted to enjoy elsewhere previous to the Revolution.

The letter which follows, written from Natland, has been kindly furnished from the MS. collections of Mr. Morehouse, the author of the "History of Lydgate Chapel," &c. It is addressed to one of his early pupils, Mr. Elston, then a tutor in a gentleman's family in Sussex, and afterwards minister to an Independent church at Topcliff, near Wakefield.

"My dear Friend,—I could not well be longer silent without telling you how we are and enquiering how you doe. We all here (through mercy) are in health, and, which is more, we are yet, through the wonderfull care and protection of our Heavenly Father, in peace. It seems strange to all that consider of it how it should be soe, but I desire wholly to look beyond second causes as to this. There be six of our family just now goeing for Scotland, in order to their becoming graduates in the spring, viz., Sam. Yates, John Heywood and his brother,

Thom. Cotton, Chr. Richardson and Gift Kirby. Their godly parents were very doubtfull what to resolve about their goeing, in respect of the times, and that dark cloud which still hangs over us. Yet at last they have concluded to let them goe, but have engaged me to goe along with them. John Issot stays with me. Severall (through mercy) of our late Dissenting Professors are now come in, and our number is considerably increased. Thers great hopes of the Gospells successe if our peace and liberty be continued. Dear Friend, let us hear how it is with you, and with that worthy family wherein God hath cast you. That relation you gave in your letter of soe worthy a son of the late eminent Dr. Ames was noe small comfort to me. I would willingly goe some miles to see him (should Providence cast me into your parts) for his father's sake, but whether ever that may be is very doubtfull.

"Pray, dear Friend, let me hear fully how it is with you in all respects, and impart what news you have. Time will not suffer me to enlarge; soe with mine and all our dear respects to you, leaveing in the armes of our gracious Father, I rest, your ever affectionately endeared friend,

"*Natl., Sept.* 25, 1676." "Ri. ffranckland."

During his residence at Natland, he preached, in defiance of the persecuting laws, in his own house and elsewhere in that district, and thus attracted the notice of the degraded men who, as informers and prosecutors, wrought the purposes of intolerant Churchmen. But he lived at Natland from 1674 until the spring of 1683. Then the enforcement of the Five-Mile Act made it convenient to him to get to a greater distance from the borough-town of Kendal. He found a place of refuge for himself and pupils in Calton, an insignificant village on the banks of the Eure. Calton Hall, the family house of Major-General Lambert, was his dwelling here.* In less than a year he was compelled to make other changes, going to Dawsonfold, Hartborough, and Cartmell Sands, on Morecombe Bay. In 1686, he removed to the immediate neighbourhood of Sheffield, where the Nonconformist interest had been from the first considerable, and found for three or four years a home at Attercliffe. Wherever he went he was followed by legal troubles. Like the poor hunted hare, he returned at last to his original seat, re-establishing himself after the Revolution in his own house at Rathmel.

Postponing for the present some statements respecting the academy, we proceed to notice some of the sufferings of the Yorkshire confessors of Nonconformity.

The closing years of the reign of Charles II. were times of rigorous persecution to the Nonconformists. That period was, in the nervous words of good Oliver Heywood, "a day of rebuke

* Mr. Hunter (Life of Heywood, p. 290, note) has detected traces of Puritanism at an early date in the family of Lambert, of Calton. One member of the family, the wife of the General's son (by birth a Lister, of Arnoldsbiggen), was accustomed to attend Nonconformist worship. She induced Mr. Frankland to preach in Craven, at first against her husband's wishes, but he afterwards changed his feelings on the subject, though he continued to be a Churchman.

and blasphemy, a day of scattering and treading down in the valley of vision; ministers and their flocks rent asunder, solemn assemblies sorrowfully broken up, and silent sabbaths by some profaned; ignorance increasing, ... persecution revived, and thousands of precious souls wandering about as sheep that have no shepherd."

To the heart of Mr. Frankland the sorrows of that trying time came home through the sufferings of some who had stood to him in the relation of pupils, and who for exercising the ministry, for which he had so well prepared them, were visited with all the penalties of the Carolinian persecuting laws. The late Mr. Hunter tells the story with simple brevity in his invaluable Life of Oliver Heywood (p. 310):

"Two young ministers, who had been pupils in the academy of Frankland, and who were settled in the ministry at Leeds and Sheffield, *were marked for this persecution, as examples, it may seem, to deter the other pupils of that seminary,* viz. Thomas Whitaker and Timothy Jollie, the son of Thomas Jollie, of Altham. They were imprisoned for a long period in the Castle at York, and the death during that period of the young wife of Mr. Whitaker made his case the more grievous; but they both bore it with a fortitude such that the example operated to encourage, not to deter."

Presently another and most valued friend of Frankland was incarcerated in the same prison, his college companion, Oliver Heywood. The worthy tutor would naturally anticipate that his own time of imprisonment might not be far distant. But he did not allow the danger to interfere with the faithful performance of the sacred duties of friendship. He visited his imprisoned friends, and probably received from their account of themselves and the mode in which they passed their time in the house of bondage, more comfort than he affected to give them. Greatly would the talk which week by week spread over the hills and through the valleys of the north, and was repeated and prayed over by so many firesides, increase the affection of the Nonconformists for their ministers and confirm them in their principles. Not only love and pity for the sufferers, but a feeling of indignation against their persecutors would arise, when they heard how the innocent and godly prisoners bore their sufferings with gentle patience, reading together the word of God, and such books as Fox's Acts and Monuments, Baxter's Paraphrase and Poole's Annotations,—praying together twice or thrice a day,—preaching to the unhappy inmates of their abode as often as the jailor would permit them,—and knowing no other variation or alleviation of their days and weeks of monotonous sorrow, than the occasional visit of some brother in Nonconformity as fearless as the kind-hearted tutor of the northern academy.

(To be continued.)

DEPRIVATION OF THE REV. D. I. HEATH.*

Ecclesiastical discipline is a chapter of chances in the Church of England. The cumbersomeness, expense and uncertainty of the law, and (partly as a consequence) the reluctance of ecclesiastical superiors to publish Church scandals needlessly, give large impunity alike to heresy, folly and vice. Strange that the same lay tribunals which decide upon immoralities as in the Stepney case, upon rubrical vagaries and riots like those of St. Barnabas's and St. George's-in-the-East, have to pronounce upon questions of orthodox doctrine also, as in the long-vexed and at last evaded question of baptismal regeneration.

Just now trials for heresy are in the ascendant, though the omissions to prosecute are yet more notorious than the prosecutions. Of the authors of those Essays and Reviews which were so summarily condemned by Convocation, only one is as yet cited to the Ecclesiastical Court, though the "unsound theology" of another has been a second time "discountenanced by bad morality" in congregation at Oxford. But while Dr. Rowland Williams, a man of profound scholarship and undoubted power, who has lately discomfited one Welsh Bishop on questions of learning and shewn himself fully equal to another as a master of fence, is waiting for the Bishop of Salisbury's legal arguments against his review of Bunsen, an interlude of lighter order comes off in the Court of Arches, which seems to confute the maxim (at least as applicable to the Ecclesiastical Courts), *De minimis non curat lex.* The prosecution of Mr. Heath by the Bishop of Winchester, issuing in the deprivation of the former (against which, however, he appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council), is, we take the liberty of thinking, a contemptible affair from the point of view furnished by general ecclesiastical practice and general episcopal apathy. It is not, however, on this account the less deserving of notice, nor the less truly illustrative of the need of reform both in the doctrinal constitution and the legal administration of the Church.

The Rev. Dunbar Isidore Heath, a clergyman in middle life, was educated at Cambridge, where he graduated and obtained a

---

* Sermons on Important Subjects, by the Rev. D. I. Heath, Vicar of Brading, Isle of Wight, and late Fellow of Trin. Col. Cam. Tallant and Co.

Heath *v.* Burder. Case on behalf of the Rev. Dunbar Isidore Heath, Clerk, the Appellant.

Joint Appendix to Case, &c.

Judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the Appeal of the Rev. Dunbar Isidore Heath, Clerk, *versus* John Burder, from the Arches Court of Canterbury, delivered July 9, 1860.

Why am I prosecuted? By Rev. Dunbar Isidore Heath, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and still Vicar of Brading, Isle of Wight. 12mo. Pp. 8.

Will Mr. Heath lose his Living? 12mo. Pp. 11.

To the Dissenting Ministers of the Isle of Wight. A Letter, by Rev. D. I. Heath. 12mo. Pp. 15.

Fellowship in Trinity College. In 1846, he was presented by the Master, Fellows and Scholars of his College, with the vicarage of Brading, in the east-central portion of the Isle of Wight (a parish lying a little to the north of Sandown and its beautiful bay).

Of the secret genesis of the proceedings which have brought the Vicar of Brading so prominently into public notice, we have heard this account. There is a clerical club in the Isle of Wight, the members of which hold a monthly meeting for the reading and expounding of scripture and the consideration of theological subjects. Of this club Mr. Heath was a member, and, in common with others, exercised his right of giving his opinion and criticising the expressed opinions of others. The frequent divergence of his opinions on theology from those of his brethren, led to a motion that Mr. Heath should no longer be a member of the club. By the slenderest majority his ejection was effected. Regarding their act as a wilful shutting of clerical eyes against the light of truth, Mr. Heath expressed his purpose to go into the parishes of his brethren and teach the people that which he saw reason for thinking they would not have the opportunity of learning from their appointed spiritual pastors and teachers. Engaging a room at Ryde, Mr. Heath lectured, and with considerable success, to numerous audiences. In what other parishes he may have lectured we are not informed. The novel manifestation of the missionary spirit was warmly resented by the clergy of the island as a schismatical and dangerous precedent. They appealed to Dr. Sumner, the Bishop of Winchester, to suppress the itinerant lecturings of the Vicar of Brading. Their appeal brought the latter into correspondence with his diocesan, and the result was the prosecution for heresies against the doctrines of the Church of England and the Thirty-nine Articles, contained in the volume of Sermons published in March, 1858.

In the early proceedings in the suit, Mr. Heath succeeded (July 9, 1860) in forcing from the prosecutor a distinct specification of the charges brought against him, and of the unsound doctrine of which he was supposed to be guilty. In the documents and arguments adduced in this part of the case, Mr. Heath made large use of the proceedings against the Rev. Francis Stone in 1807, of which a full account may be found in the early volumes of the *Monthly Repository*.

Mr. Heath's heresies are all, we understand, contained in the volume of Sermons cited by us; and those for which he has been prosecuted are thus summed up in the little pamphlet of eight pages addressed to a friend:

"Dear Friend,—You ask me what I am being prosecuted for? Not an easy question to answer, I assure you. After more than a year's delay, and at the expense of several hundred pounds, his Lordship, the Bishop of Winchester, has at last told me that I am wrong on certain subjects; but he has not told me what he thinks is wrong.

"He says, You are wrong on Justification; you are wrong on Faith and Belief; you are wrong on Propitiation and Satisfaction; you are wrong on God's Wrath and Anger; you are wrong on Forgiveness of Sins; you are wrong on Repentance and Faith; you are wrong on Heaven; you are wrong on Penalty of Sin and Guilt of Sin; and lastly, you are wrong in saying that certain words and phrases are not scriptural.

"For your information, then, I can inform you that the Bishop thinks I am so wrong on all these points that I am not fit to be an incumbent of the Church of England; but if you ask me in what way the Bishop thinks me wrong, I have not a scrap of information to give you. Perhaps he thinks I am wrong in one way on these subjects, perhaps in another. I dare say there are twenty ways of being wrong on each of these subjects; so there may be 180 ways of being wrong altogether.

"I will now give you my real opinion on each of these nine points, where the Bishop thinks I am wrong. When I have done so, I think you will agree with me that I am not wrong on any one of them.

"First, then, on Justification. Just as Sanctification is the breathing in of a spirit of sanctity or holiness among men by the most Holy and Personal Spirit of Holiness, so it is clear that Justification is the breathing in of the most vital and essential spirit of Justice by the great and Personal Justifier, the Lord of Justice, Jesus Christ. This is exactly what our 13th Article says about it, and it is exactly my own opinion. The Article under the name of Justification talks of the breathing in or inspiration of a certain spirit, which of course can be none other than the spirit of Justice, or else it would not be called Justification. Justice, you are quite aware, is different from holiness. A holy man, notwithstanding his holiness, may place his neighbours in wrong places; but Justice places men in their just places, and that is why it is called Justice.

"As it seems, then, I am safe enough on this point under our own Articles, I go on to the question of Faith.

"Faith I consider to be Trust. Jesus Christ came to preach and introduce this spirit of faith, or trust, among men. He himself shewed us the example on the cross of trusting in the Father, and his Resurrection was a clear proof that that Trust was not misplaced. The more men trust God, the more they will be able to trust each other; and the more they trust each other, the more they will be able to trust God. Trust is a principle of action. When we trust to any one, we mean that we trust to him in something we are about to do; we lean on him—we lean forward—we are said to walk by faith; and when we walk across the room, we are always trusting to something future at each step; for whenever we raise our foot, we trust to the floor of the room to sustain us when we put it down again. This is my opinion on this point, and I am quite right in it according to our own Articles; for our 17th Article names the faith in eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, and of course this is a faith in something future.

"The next point is on Propitiation and Satisfaction, in which I am quite right.

"It is a shockingly wrong idea to suppose that the good God requires to be propitiated or bribed by the sufferings of His Son. You know a great deal better than this yourself. The Jewish priest used to make an atonement, or propitiation, or satisfaction, or whatever we like to call it. Yes, of course he did. So did Jesus Christ. Yes, of course he did.

The shocking thing is, that any Christian should be so ignorant as to suppose he did it for God. He did it for himself, and the altar, and the congregation, for whom it was much wanted. I am right on this point according to our 31st Article; for the Article says the offering of Christ was a redemption as well as a propitiation and satisfaction; and to suppose that Jesus Christ *redeemed* God, is so uncommonly absurd as to require no further notice; and yet I much fear the Bishop must think the Article says that Jesus Christ propitiated God.

"We now come to God's Anger and Wrath, in which I am quite right according to our own Prayer Book; for we teach in our Catechism that children are born naturally the children of wrath, and yet at the very same moment that we call them children of wrath, we say we are persuaded of God's goodwill towards them. This clearly shews that God's wrath must be something which does not prevent him from having goodwill at the same time, and in fact the wrath is the name for something in man not in God; it is like the mist in man's eye, which prevents him seeing the sun; not a mist in the sun, but in man's eyes or the earth's atmosphere.

"Forgiveness of Sins comes next, and three words will shew that Remission is not the same as Forgiveness in common English language. If any one were to talk about remission of sinners, or remitting sinners for their sins, he would talk nonsense. We say forgiveness of sinners, not remission of sinners; therefore forgiveness is not exactly the same as remission. Moreover, the Lords of the Privy Council, in their own judgment of July 9, 1860, said they would remit the case to the lower court, and it would have been nonsense to say they would forgive the case to the lower court.

"The next doctrine is about Heaven. I believe that the whole human race will be united into one grand kingdom, and that there will be eternal differences of degrees in that kingdom. The highest will have eternal glory, and the lowest will have eternal damnation. A grown-up man is in error if he still believes what his nurse, I suppose, taught him on this point. Nurses know no better. I have an affection for a good many people who have some rather bad faults, and I do not believe for one moment that in the next age God will prevent me enjoying the pleasure of their society.

"We next come to Penalty of Sin and Guilt of Sin; but here there is no doubt at all that I am altogether right according to the Articles; for the Articles talk sometimes of original sin, and sometimes of original guilt, meaning the same thing; so that guilt means just sin; and what I have said is, that the way to put away what is called guilt, is to put away the sin itself. I also say that sin is its own penalty.

"As to the last charge, that certain phrases are not in scripture, certainly they are not. If they are, it will be very easy to produce them. Shew me the chapter and verse which talks of our going to heaven, or of the immortality of our souls, and so on. The Scriptures talk of the kingdom of heaven and of the resurrection of the body.

"Thus I have answered your question, why I am being prosecuted. It seems very odd, very unnecessary, very expensive, very silly. I did all I could to prevent it."

Of Mr. Heath we know nothing personally; but his own ex-

planations above cited, like his sermons on which the accusation was based, shew him to be a most painstaking, scripture-loving and simple-minded man, only *too* literal in his mode of dealing with scripture, while very fanciful (yet orthodox enough there) in bringing passages together through the mere affinity of sound, and, we may say perhaps, crochety in some of his theories of scripture doctrine. In many of his expressions there is a truly healthy morality protesting against theological notions which are usually regarded as essential to orthodoxy, but which he does not scruple to call "detestable doctrines" (p. 91), "contemptible systems of modern theology" (p. 176), "regardless of the first principles of common sense and grammatical propriety" (p. 145). Such expressions as these have doubtless given great offence.

Mr. F. D. Maurice, in a letter in Macmillan's Magazine (Dec. 1861), says of Mr. Heath and his writings:

"His language is that of an ingenious, erudite, solitary, eccentric thinker. He has been annoyed by certain statements and phrases of his brethren which seem to him not irrational, but unscriptural [both irrational and unscriptural, we take Mr. Heath to say]. He has tried to correct them by philological crochets which half-a-dozen persons in England may understand, or may perceive to contain the hint of truths, which few or none will adopt. . . . . He is a gentleman and a scholar; he is a faithful parish priest."

The editor of the French Protestant journal, *Le Lien* (whom nothing seems to escape in English theology and ecclesiastical affairs), has founded a corresponding estimate of Mr. Heath on his writings:

"He seems a man whose ideas are original and strange rather than profound, and who clings to words more than to things, to formularies of expression rather than to the realities of the inner spiritual life." (Nov. 16.)

This clinging to words more than things is seen in the opening passage of Sermon xii., on which what he calls "the last charge" was founded. It is a strange and unreasonable passage, but is literally correct in its assertions, and was not proved to be otherwise at the trial; but largely contributed, we believe, to his condemnation:

"The more I study the Bible for myself, the more astounding I find it how many of the most fundamental ideas and phrases of modern theology have been foisted in without sanction from that all-sufficing record of our religion. One after another, no less than about twenty ideas or phrases, such as guilt of sin, paying a penalty, going to heaven, going to hell, immortality of the soul, satisfaction, imputed righteousness, appropriating the work of Christ, necessary to salvation, and many others, have vanished from my system, because, as a minister of Christ, studying these matters professionally, I see them to be phrases and ideas, not only absent from scripture, but darkening and confusing the clearest of the otherwise most intelligible and comforting statements of Holy Writ. The stewards of the mysteries of Christ have much to answer for.

They are the causes of the infidelity against which they rail in such a cursing spirit."

Elsewhere (p. 198) he speaks of the word "merit" as unscriptural. He does not, however, include *Trinity*, *Deity of Christ*, *God the Son* or *God the Holy Ghost* (as he might have done), among the unscriptural phrases.

He cannot be contradicted as to the fact that his enumerated phrases are unscriptural. And in connection with the rejection of some of them he avows true and important moral distinctions. The guilt of sin, he says, is not to be put away, but the sin itself.

"Absurd nonsense! Can the guilt of lying be destroyed or buried or washed away, except by destroying or burying or washing away the lying itself? Is there less penalty for lying on the resurrection side of the pit, among those who know their Lord's will, than on the other side before the 'penalty' was (as the fools say) 'paid'?"—P. 116.

His objection to the phrases, "paying the penalty," "going to heaven and hell," &c., seems to arise out of the great conviction "that hell and the wrath of God is *our own selves revealed to us truly in the gospel*, and which Jesus came to deliver us from" (p. 77). The "immortality of the soul" he thinks a phrase of heathen philosophy (as perhaps it is, if not rather of human instinct); but he says, "I believe in eternal life and eternal death,"—to the latter of which phrases we might demur on his own ground of its being unscriptural. On *satisfaction*, *imputed righteousness*, *appropriating the work of Christ*, &c., he is nobly moral, whether orthodox or not, and (we must add) whether quite clear and intelligible or not:

"God will be satisfied and pleased or propitiated when men who have ten talents are enabled, by the success of Jesus in the world, to enjoy ten talents' worth of life, and when men who have one talent shall be able to enjoy that one talent's worth, and when the pitch dark theology of Law, which loves darkness rather than light, is able to move off into the outer darkness, away from the light which it hates. God's justice not yet satisfied; therefore God cannot be merciful! What a desolate, foul abomination! What a crooked notion of Deity! How utterly unscriptural; how utterly degrading! And God's justice satisfied by what? By the crucifixion! By the most glaring piece of injustice ever committed in the whole history of the world, by the greatest crime and most accursed deed ever committed! Woe to them that are with child and to them that give suck to such a system, that draw the grossest nonsense up with cords of vanity and place it in the most holy place. If any of these men, brethren, who stand this abomination where it ought not, shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or Lo, He is there, believe him not. Study the simple theology of Grace which makes Jesus to be the agent of the Father, purchasing back the world to the Father, and sacrificing himself to sin in the attempt, for the sake of His inheritance; and Jesus, having bought the inheritance by His sin-offering to sin, will fill it full of love, and the fruits of love, and present it to the Father as a peace-offering, a sweet savour to God. This is the Gospel. This is Christianity."—P. 195.

This passage implies two or three more ideas belonging to Mr. Heath's "system" which we wish to specify a little more particularly; some of them do not seem to have been in the list of his cited heresies. The passage is also a specimen of that mixed wildness and literalism in the use of scripture phraseology for which Mr. Heath is remarkable. Surely he is right, morally right, in his mode of speaking of the crucifixion, and in reprobating the common orthodox ideas that cluster round it. Yet we do not find that he has grasped the scriptural idea (so natural to Jewish Christians) which saw in the death of Jesus an analogy to the old sin-offering of the Law, in its having justified both Jews and Gentiles, and placed them for ever within reach of the mercy-seat without further sacrifice. Another of Mr. Heath's special ideas transpires here, namely, that Jesus sacrificed himself *to sin*, and redeemed the world from sin. This is a great improvement upon the vulgar orthodox idea that he redeemed (bought) men from God, under whose curse they lay. It is not unlike the old middle-age notion that he redeemed men from the devil; but it is said (though we do not find proof in these Sermons) that Mr. Heath doubts the personal existence of Satan. He has not found out, apparently, that *redeemed* means delivered even without actual price, as the Israelites were redeemed from Pharaoh, who gained nothing but a loss as the price of letting his slaves go.

Mr. Heath's ideas of Justification are more English than theological or scriptural. To justify is to do justice, he says; to put everybody in his proper place. "Justified freely. Yes. This is what I have long seen. We shall, without any conditions at all on our part, be placed in our righteous or just places; and it will be through the grace and favour of God that this result will be obtained. The rogue, the hypocrite and the great Christian, will each, by the favour of God, find his level unconditionally" (p. 119). He anticipates the second coming of Christ as the means of completing these just arrangements (pp. 55, 62); and describes himself as one of a party in the Church who "see that the Spirit is an invisible comforter, who strives upon the face of the turbulent waters, until a *Man* shall come whom (who) God has ordained, shall establish rightness both among the quick and the dead. This party says, We shall never get right by going on as we are now. We must wait for Jesus. They think the hope of the Church is the coming again of the man Christ Jesus, to cast out all scandals and offences and to introduce the kingdom of Righteousness." Whether such a party has any recognized existence in the Church of England, or only in Mr. Heath's imagination, we cannot tell. He seems to anticipate "the reconciliation of the whole world and the obedience of the whole world" (pp. 100, 103). He has a striking but (in what should be its positive doctrine) obscure sermon, No. xi., intitled, *Ne-*

hushtan, the Dead Christ, from the text, "Is it Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again?" in earnest deprecation of the views of "the great majority of the present generation," by whom "the *death* of Christ is far more looked to than his *work while alive,* whether before or after his resurrection" (p. 107). And there is another curious sermon, No. xvii., intitled, *Circulating and Poured-out Blood,* in which he pursues the same idea, somewhat mystically maintaining that in the efficacy ascribed in scripture to the blood of Christ, allusion is generally made not to "poured-out blood," but "circulating blood, which, while it remains and circulates within the warm body, is the principle of *life* and edification or growth." And in the ninth sermon, on *Propitiation,* there is this bold and finely moral passage:

"There are many savage nations still where blood for blood is the rule; propitiation by the shedding of blood is one of the oldest institutions of the world. Now I am afraid it is a very common idea that the glorious and great God and Father of mankind, all-holy and all-loving, was propitiated 1800 years ago by blood, and is propitiated now at this minute by our faith in this blood. I know not how to find words strong enough to express my abhorrence of this detestable doctrine. God is propitiated by Christ; but Christ's blood has long ago been poured out, not to propitiate his kind and benevolent Father, but to bring men up to his Father, out of the system of law which kept them away from the Father, and into the system of freedom and spirit and mercy and grace and faith which is pleasing to the Father. Christ is at this moment the propitiation, not for our sins only, but for the whole world."—P. 91.

If to these quotations we add that Mr. Heath insists upon translating those passages which seem to demand faith *in* Christ by "the faith *of* Christ," that is, "the same identical faith as His," we have brought out the most salient points of his "system," and perhaps disclosed more heresies than the nine charged against him. It is plain that he rejects as immoral all those conventional phrases and ideas of the common orthodoxy which morality requires to be explained away by those who profess them. But Mr. Heath appears quite unconscious of holding any doctrines contrary to the Church Articles, as he concludes his little letter to his friend by saying,—

"I have done no harm by casting out from the minds of my neighbours a great deal of metaphysical nonsense, which I am quite sure nobody understood, and I am perfectly certain that I have not attacked a single doctrine of the very liberal and sensible Church of England."

We do not venture to decide so difficult a question against him. The Judicial Committee of Privy Council may possibly reverse Dr. Lushington's judgment. But, whatever may be the ultimate decision, we have the same reflection to make, the same question to urge, What is the use, advantage or purpose of the Thirty-nine Articles? Mr. Heath has signed them, no doubt conscientiously, yet he is charged with nine heresies and con-

victed of four, while unconscious of having committed one. If his deprivation be confirmed, how hard upon him is it that those Articles should be so unintelligible! If it be reversed, what a snare they have been to the Bishop and clergy of Winchester! The heresy may prove perhaps to be on their part. And all this doubt and uncertainty in a Church founded expressly upon uniformity and orthodoxy! It is a practical satire upon such pretensions.

It is particularly worthy of notice that the Judge in an Ecclesiastical Court allows no reference to be made to scripture in defence of one accused of heresy. The Church in many of its Articles appeals to the authority of scripture, and in the twentieth seems to make its own authority quite subordinate: "It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it so expound one place of scripture that it be repugnant to another." But when we come to the point of law, we find the Article is paramount and Scripture is put out of court. Dr. Lushington makes this quite clear, as in the nature of things it must be. He quoted the judgment of Lords Langdale, Campbell, Wensleydale, Kingsdown, with the two Archbishops and himself, in the Gorham case, as laying down this principle:

"This question must be decided by the Articles and the Liturgy, and we must apply to the construction of those books the same rules which have been long established, and are by law applicable to the construction of all written instruments."

In his own person he observed (shewing that *lax subscription* is not the lawyer's idea of clerical duty or privilege in signing):

"It was contrary to all probability, as well as irreconcilable with the ordinary rules of construction in so solemn a proceeding as the establishment of the Articles of Religion or Book of Common Prayer, to presume that anything was inserted *to be inoperative or rejected.*"

Again:

"It was no part of his province, and he distinctly disclaimed any attempt, to affix any meaning to this Article by any reference of his own to the Holy Scriptures."

And,

"He thought that every clergyman of the Established Church was bound to bear in mind the Articles of Religion in every sermon which he preached and published."

These are the necessary consequences of having theological Articles sanctioned by Act of Parliament and capable of being enforced like other parliamentary enactments. But did not the learned Judge confuse himself a little when he confuted Mr. Heath's assertion that the phrase "necessary to salvation" is unscriptural, *by finding it in the sixth Article?* We suggest this as a point for Mr. Heath in his appeal.

One of the tender mercies of the Ecclesiastical Court is to give the option of *retractation.* As Bishop Bonner gave opportunity to Protestants and Cranmer to Anabaptists when condemned to the stake to retract their belief and substitute a falsehood, the Court of Arches offered Mr. Heath the same alternative as the condition of retaining his preferment. But it seems not to have been very clear what or how he must have retracted if he had been disposed. What a reproach to the Court, to the Law and to the Church, was his quiet answer, "Well, my answer must be that I do not know what the law requires of me"! After retiring with his advocate, he still returned the same answer; and thereupon sentence of deprivation was pronounced. Here is the record of that solemn burlesque by which opinions are settled for the clergy in this Protestant country:

"The charge of heresy brought against the Rev. D. I. Heath by the Bishop of Winchester, came again before the Court of Arches on Saturday.—Dr. Lushington said the Court gave Mr. Heath a fortnight to consider whether he would retract according to the statute; and if he declared that day that he was ready to retract, the Court would give him further time to shape his retractation.—Dr. Phillimore said Mr. Heath found considerable difficulty in knowing exactly how to act in this matter; among other reasons, because he did not quite understand, with regard to the thirteen articles brought against him, whether the decision of the Court was that they were to be retracted separately from and independently of each other, or what shape the retractation was to assume. He thought it only fair, therefore, to ask that a form of retractation should be suggested either by the other side or by the Court. —Dr. Lushington said there were four articles proved which the Court thought contained erroneous doctrines. If Mr. Heath were prepared to retract the errors contained in those four articles, that was all the Court could desire; but it was for Mr. Heath to frame his retractation, and not for the Court or the opposite party to take any steps in the matter. —Dr. Phillimore then explained aloud to Mr. Heath, who is extremely deaf, that the Court required him at once to make up his mind whether or not he would retract the errors contained in the articles proved against him, the precise form of retractation being reserved.—Mr. Heath said it was impossible for him to retract the passages.—Dr. Phillimore: Well, as to the errors contained in them?—Mr. Heath: The errors as charged, or as laid down in the judgment? They are different.—Dr. Phillimore: The errors contained in the judgment.—Mr. Heath: Well, I really don't know what is wanted of me. (Turning to the Judge)—Perhaps if I had another fortnight I could make up my mind. To-day I really do not know what is wanted.—Dr. Phillimore: Of course, my Lord, the sentence is what Mr. Heath has to look to. The errors which he is required to retract must be the errors referred to in the sentence.—Dr. Lushington: I require an answer to this question—Is Mr. Heath prepared to retract according to law or not? If he is, I will give him further time to shape retractation; if he is not, I must proceed to pronounce sentence.—Dr. Phillimore having repeated to Mr. Heath the formal question just put from the Bench, Mr. Heath, after a pause, said: Well, my answer must be, that I don't know what the law requires of

me.—With the consent of the Court, Dr. Phillimore retired with his client for consultation. On their return, after the lapse of only two or three minutes, Dr. Phillimore said: Mr. Heath instructs me to say, my Lord, that he has no other answer to make than that which he has made. —Dr. Lushington: Then I am bound to pronounce against Mr. Heath the sentence of deprivation; and I do so accordingly, with costs. Notice of an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was immediately after given on behalf of Mr. Heath."

We do not wonder that thoughtful men, both clerical and lay, should feel grieved at such proceedings. As we have already hinted, the Rev. F. D. Maurice has written a remarkable letter to the editor of Macmillan's Magazine on this subject. He says many of the newspapers, especially the High-Church ones, have expressed contempt for both the defendant and the Judge. "The *Spectator* (he adds) appears to think that neither the defendant nor the Judge is so much to blame as the Thirty-nine Articles. This trial adds one more proof, it intimates, to the mass of proofs that clergymen of this day who subscribe a document which was compiled in the sixteenth century, involve themselves in an ignominious slavery, and in probable, almost certain, falsehood." Agreeing, as we cannot avoid doing, with the *Spectator* in this opinion, we wish Mr. Maurice had addressed himself to its refutation, which does not seem to be attempted in any of the three divisions of his letter. First, he estimates Mr. Heath justly and kindly, and deprecates the legal procedure against him as a gross mistake, quoting the far worse "eccentricity" of a fashionable Evangelical preacher who was not brought into the Arches Court for it, and noticing, as one result of the sentence, that Plato's doctrine of immortality is decreed to be identical henceforth with the "divine and eternal life set forth in the gospel." "The Bishop of Winchester has set his seal to it." "Blessed effect of persecution! If experience ever could teach Churchmen, the splendid irony of this fact might do us some good."

Mr. Maurice then turns to the Judge and his judgment. He "cannot read Dr. L.'s decision without seeing in it traces of a tenderness, humility, desire to do justice, which he believes he should look for in vain in most learned divines." He felt, on reading it, "Oh that this excellent man had given full scope to his lay instincts! Oh that he had simply followed his common-law traditions! Then theology would have been safe in his hands," &c. He acknowledges that (as the *Spectator* hinted) he is "one of that large company which this sentence, according to its obvious construction, would separate from the ministry of the Church." It is Dr. Lushington's reading of the doctrine of Justification in the eleventh Article and Propitiation in the second, that would deprive Mr. Maurice as well as Mr. Heath. For Mr. M. declares "that we are accepted by God in Christ, the Head of all men; that our faith is grounded upon what He

is and what He has done, *and is in no sense the cause of our acceptance;* and that this faith is in a Redeemer, not in any tenet about particular redemption or general redemption. This doctrine may be condemned by Dr. L.'s reading of the eleventh Article. I fear it is. I cannot help that. I must preach this gospel or none." Mr. Maurice equally objects to the heathen notion of propitiation, "the Magee notion of propitiation," which Dr. L.'s judgment fastens upon the second Article; and thinks that all who feel as he does "ought to assist Mr. Heath in prosecuting his appeal."

Thus far we might have fancied Mr. Maurice was pretty much of the *Spectator's* mind. But no. These troubles, perplexities and inconsistencies do not point to the Articles as their cause. In the concluding paragraph of his letter, Mr. Maurice indignantly rejects the *Spectator's* implied suggestion: "And now I will venture to ask, why I am bound by the opinions I have expressed, or by any which I have not expressed in this letter, to wish myself free from the obligations of those terrible sixteenth century Articles?"

No reader of Mr. Maurice's writings will ever expect to find him bound by the opinions he expresses, to come to the conclusion to which the expression of those opinions would lead every one else. The subtlety of mind that can hug the Athanasian Creed as a manifesto of universal charity and a rebuke of unbelief in one's own private heart, can see in the evils of an ecclesiastical sentence based upon the Church Articles, the vindication of those Articles themselves! Mr. Maurice says, truly enough, that the nineteenth century spirit expressed in these prosecutions is very tyrannical and very mean. But he does not shew that it is not the very spirit of the Articles themselves. He finds the construction put upon the Articles in this nineteenth century "exceedingly hard and narrow," and he thinks (but this he does not shew) "inconsistent with the theology of the Fathers or of the Reformers, of the Creeds and of our Prayers." He finds "each nineteenth century sect and school ready to spring at the throat of every other." He finds "divines and prelates of the nineteenth century ready, or at least submitting, to accomplish the wishes of these sects, and of the journals that represent them." He says, "I fully believe that if these sects and journals, and their instruments, have their way, there will be an end of the *documents which restrain their violence*, to which they must appeal, and which, by fair means or foul, they would compel to speak their language." And he concludes with rebuking the age for mammon-worship. We can only wonder at such a conclusion from such premisses. The course of argument is this:

The Ecclesiastical Courts enforce the Articles;
They are used tyrannically and meanly for that purpose;

The sects within the Church are on each other's throats like fighting-dogs.

Therefore: Do not abolish the Articles which alone give the right to quarrel with one another.

Regard those Articles, by means of which Mr. Heath is oppressed, as the means of restraining the violence against him. The Articles which deprive him are his protection. Were he not amenable to Articles, he would be worse used.

So Mr. Maurice replies to the *Spectator*.

The *Saturday Review* (Nov. 23) clearly points out the danger to the Church which these prosecutions for heresy threaten, by deterring, as they inevitably will, all the better order of minds from entering its ministry, and dooming it to be represented by dunces in a literary and philosophical age. It is plain that the influence of the Church could not last long under such conditions. But the *Saturday Review* does not go to the root of the question. Instead of bantering the Bishops who now and then put the rusty machinery of persecution in motion, and are in fact the most consistent representatives of the Church of England as a doctrinal Church demanding strict unity of opinion, why does not the *Saturday Review*, and every other journal, both secular and religious, that looks contemptuously, sadly or disapprovingly upon the Heath prosecution, manfully point to the source of the evil in the continued pretence of a doctrinal unity, which is not possible at present, if ever it was? But the *Saturday Review* evades the real question, and virtually suggests the continued heartless, hollow policy of Broad-church laxity:

"The plan of securing absolute uniformity of religious thought among the clergy by legal process, has been handed down to us from an age which differed very widely from our own. It is not on that account necessarily a bad plan, but it is a plan with whose workings we are not familiar, and which may possibly, under altered circumstances, produce very different results from those for which we look. There is no question of its justice. If men are willing to mortgage their right of free speech, and bind themselves to teach only certain dogmas, they cannot complain if, when the bond is broken, the mortgagee forecloses. But the expediency of the plan is quite another question. We have a perfect right to pull this rusty old matchlock out of our armoury, but the consciousness of that right will be a very small consolation when we discover that its recoil is its most formidable effect. Some of the Bishops have of late years shewn signs of a strong attachment to this weapon, which may be partly accounted for by the fact that the possibility of levelling any legal machinery against themselves is remote enough. Has it ever occurred to them to inquire what will be the effect upon the clergy at large of being admonished by a few startling examples that deprivation will for the future be the penalty of all doctrinal aberrations? 'A stricter adhesion,' the Bishops would probably reply, 'to the standards of orthodoxy.' No doubt this will be the effect among the existing clergy—just as relentless punishments produced a prompt obedience

among our sailors in the revolutionary war. But do they not reflect that in the one case, as in the other, this martinet discipline may possibly beget a disinclination to enter the service? In the navy the evil was partially remedied by the press-gang; but the press-gang is not an ecclesiastical institution. The Bishops cannot make a descent upon the University graduates, and shut them up in theological Colleges whether they will or no. It is worthy of their serious consideration whether, for the sake of getting rid of a crocheteer or two, they are not driving away the best portion of their ordination candidates.

"There are two classes of men who take orders—the few who follow for the doctrine, and the many who follow for the loaves and fishes. As long as loaves and fishes last, the allegiance of these latter is secure. But it would not be safe to count on them to maintain the efficiency and the influence of the Church of England. If it be looked at in a purely pecuniary point of view, the Church is not an attractive profession to the best men. Its lower ranks are wretchedly paid, and it has no regular promotion. Its enormous prizes either depend upon family interest, or are bestowed in furtherance of some political object. But it has attractions of its own. It offers an easy entrance to the stupid, optional work to the idle, a brevet of gentility to those who feel their need of it. So far, therefore, as the Church acts by worldly motives to draw men to her service, she only attracts those who are unfit for any busier vocation, or those to whom a clergyman's position is a rise in life. We do not pretend to say that on these the terrors of Dr. Lushington will have any material effect. They are of the kind that, to a demand to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, would reply with Theodore Hook, 'Certainly, Sir, forty if you please.' But it is not to such as these the Church will owe her permanence or her success. A Church which depended on them alone would not hold its ground for two generations. The only true test of a Church's vital power, and the measure of her probable duration, is furnished by the number of those who have joined her service for the love of the work she sets them to do. It is among these that all her moral and intellectual strength is to be found; and her forces ebb in exact proportion as their numbers dwindle or their zeal degenerates. And men of this stamp are not the men to submit with patience to be dragooned into orthodoxy by those who have been made their superiors merely by favour of the Prime Minister's calculations or caprices. This is an age in which men bear every sort of rule impatiently; but the restraint at which they chafe the most is that which curbs free thought or speech. People may view the fact how they will—they may count it as praise or as blame to our generation—but fact it remains still, to be dealt with and not to be ignored."

The *Saturday Review* does not ignore the fact, but does not attempt to deal with it.

Another recent expression of lay opinion on Church matters is intitled to notice before we conclude. Mr. Disraeli, at a recent meeting of the Oxford Diocesan Societies at Aylesbury (at which the Bishop of Oxford presided), made a long and elaborate speech on Church matters, ending with a defence of church-rates, and a political appeal to Church sympathies and prejudices against the poor bugbear of the Anti-State-Church

Society. He described the condition of the Church truly enough as void of unity, and that want of unity he ascribed somewhat fancifully to three feelings influencing different bodies of Churchmen, namely, "a feeling of perplexity, a feeling of distrust and a feeling of discontent." The "feeling of perplexity" arises from "the state of party in the Church." Mr. Disraeli (whom we do not undertake to reconcile to himself throughout the different parts of his speech) says truly, that there always have been parties in the Church of England and in every Church. "But," he adds, "there is this peculiarity in the Church of England, that parties have always been permitted, nay, recognized and sanctioned,"—which might possibly have seemed true if we had never heard of prosecutions in the Ecclesiastical Courts. He concludes that "parties in the Church, instead of being signs of its weakness, are rather symbols of its strength,"—which we should conclude also in a Church *founded on diversity*, but must take to be a confession of weakness in one that is founded on minute Articles. But Mr. Disraeli shall refute himself in the next head of his speech, where, like the Bishop of Rochester and Dr. Lushington, he sustains the true Church principle of obedience to "engagements entered into," and reprobates the exercise of free inquiry by those who have no right to be free inquirers:

"I come now to the feeling of distrust; and I hesitate not to say that I attribute that feeling of distrust which prevails among some Churchmen to the recent publications—the recent speculations upon sacred things—that have been published by some clergymen of the Church of England. I deeply regret the publication of that volume, for the sake of the writers, and for no other reason. (Hear, hear.) I am myself in favour of free inquiry on all subjects, civil and religious, with only one condition—that the inquiry should be pursued with learning, with argument and with conscience. (Cheers.) But I think that we have a right to expect that free inquiry should be pursued by free inquirers (hear, hear), and, in my opinion, the principal authors of the work called 'Essays and Reviews,' being clergymen of the Church of England, had entered into engagements with society inconsistent with the results recommended in their publications. (Cheers.)"

"*Free inquiry should be pursued by free inquirers.*" So we think. The whole question of Church and Dissent lies here, and the whole question of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. It is but a truism after all, "that free inquiry should be pursued by free inquirers." But like many other truisms, it is practically neglected and violated. What right has Mr. Heath to be a free inquirer? What right has Mr. Maurice? What right have the Essayists and Reviewers? They have "entered into engagements with society" to the contrary. Those engagements are expressed by the Articles and Creeds. The Court of Arches is *Society's* mode of enforcing the engagements. And we are forced to be-

lieve that the best service that can be rendered to religion and free thought in this land, would be for the Evangelical Bishops (with whom our *Liberal* Ministries have well stocked the Bench) to multiply prosecutions in the Ecclesiastical Courts, till it was made to be felt by the nation how wrong it is for any but free inquirers to inquire freely; and so the nation should be forced at length to demand freedom of thought on behalf of her clergy. Even Mr. Maurice, who now hugs the chain as his defence against "sects and journals," might be glad to accept his liberty if offered. But a nearer issue apparently awaits him, pledged as he seems to be to leave the Church if the judgment against Mr. Heath be not reversed. And if it should be reversed, what a curious addition to the authorized theology of the Church of England will be made by the official sanction so given to Mr. Heath's eccentric doctrines and criticisms!

THE TIDE OF TENDENCY.

BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.

'Tis the same great, all-influencing cause,
The source of those inexorable laws
Which gives its motion to the mountain rill,
  And by the self-same impulse guided ever,
  Leads on the widening, deepening, gathering river,
The ocean's vast receptacle to fill.
And every wandering bee the flower that sips,
And every bending cowslip leaf that dips
Into the flowing rivulet, is held,
And in resistless vassalage compelled
Onward by that strong tide whose course sublime
Sinks into vast eternity from time.
'Tis the same power which from the womb of night
Calls up the dawn, and with his presence bright
Bids the sun waken into glorious birth,
And pour his spreading splendours o'er the earth
With ever-glowing, ever-growing strength,
Till reaching his meridian height at length.
It is the same mysterious, mighty power
That helps the cause of progress every hour,
And—part of Heaven's benign, transcendent plan!
Develops all that's great and good in man,
And makes him worthier in this world to be
The heir of heaven, the son of Deity.

JUSTICE TO PRIESTLEY—DR. SCHOLTEN ON MATERIALISM—"THE SOUL AND THE FUTURE LIFE."

Priestley appears to have been in all things a man before his age. He was pre-eminently a discoverer; and his intense love of truth, joined to his zeal in opening up new fields of investigation, enabled him to lay the bases of new knowledge in many a department, for the advantage of those who came after him. This is now generally admitted as regards his *purely scientific* career; due honour is accorded him as a pneumatic chemist and an electrician; but it seems to be either forgotten or wholly ignored, even by those whose theological views are mainly derived from his, that he was the modern founder of their religious opinions; and they are still more reticent, if aware, of the fact that he was the first in recent times to declare *the true nature of Man*, in relation to both his spiritual and his physical powers.

These remarks are drawn forth by the publication, in Dr. Beard's "Progress of Religious Thought," of an essay by Dr. Scholten, Professor of Theology in the University of Leyden, on "Modern Materialism and its Causes." Though there is nothing in this truly estimable as able essay to shew that its learned author has ever so much as heard of Priestley, we are indirectly indebted to him for the information that the leading doctrine of the "Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit," once so much impugned, though now "we never mention it," is not only "demonstrated" by Kant, in his Critique of Pure Reason, but has its truth allowed by "the best psychologians of the day, Canus, J. H. Fichte, Roorda, &c." What was that leading doctrine? That the human being, instead of being *dual*, composed of a body and a soul, each of an opposite nature to the other, is *a unity*,—in philosophical language, *one "homogeneous substance;"* and that, consequently, every notion of "spirit," as distinct and wholly differing from "matter," is a popular error, not capable of standing against philosophical research and scientific induction. Let us see how this dictum of Priestley's, which not one in a thousand perhaps in England is as yet capable of receiving, is supported by Dr. Scholten, in a contribution intended for the destruction of that very "Materialism" of which the dictum is the root.

"The ancient psychology," says the Doctor, "still occupying the ground on which it was left by Plato and Descartes, spoke of the soul as a separate substance, mechanically united to the body. It was thus admitted to be possible for the soul to exist independently of all bodily form; and this notion gave birth to a host of others more or less absurd, —to spectral appearances, to demoniacal possessions, to the transmigration of souls, to the pre-existence of souls, to a state intermediate between death and the resurrection, to the false idea of the resurrection which made it consist of an equally mechanical re-union of the soul

with its former body. On the same ground the question was raised whether the soul existed before its connection with a carnal organism, or whether God created a soul for every new organism. With such a conception of man, any intimate bond between the soul and the body was inconceivable; and it was in vain that the old psychologists devised hypotheses to explain the mutual action of the body on the soul and of the soul on the body, the *influxus physicus*, the divinely-regulated concomitance, of the Cartesians, the occasionalism of Geulinx. Leibnitz himself considered the soul as a monad which was united to the body—that is, to an aggregate of other monads—only by what he called 'the pre-established harmony.'"

Why, this reads almost exactly as if it were an extract from a chapter of the "Disquisitions." And not less consonant with Priestley is the following. Speaking of Materialism, Dr. Scholten says,

"Science could not continue to divide man into *two heterogeneous substances*, but saw in him, as in all other beings, *a unity developing itself organically*. If metaphysics stipulated for the *duality* of spirit and matter, mechanically joined together, one or other of these consequences ensued of necessity,—the tendency of the natural sciences could not fail to destroy one of the factors, either by denying matter, and so producing the idealism of Berkeley, or by affirming, *in accordance with truth*, that there are no forces separate from matter, and not the least trace of a substance united mechanically with an organism."

After these concessions to Materialism, how does Dr. Scholten conceive of man as a "unity," whether regarded on his physical or his spiritual side? By supposing the existence in the human being of an "essence," a "first principle," the "formative principle or over-ruling idea" of Liebig, which "realizes his organs in relation with his destiny," which "forms the matter of his body," which, "without being aware of what it does, spontaneously and surely directs the formation, the development, the harmonious concurrence of the higher organs which man needs for the realization of his destiny as a rational being." And to this utterly baseless hypothesis, the truth of which it must be naturally impossible to prove, we are to sacrifice all the conclusions which science has deduced from facts, uniting to testify that man *is* a material organism, *possessing*, by the constitution God has given him, the noble spiritual faculties which are his crown and glory! In common with all recent writers on the subject, Dr. Scholten most justly condemns that theory of a "vital principle" to which the last generation gave many supporters. How is it he does not see that this notion of a "formative principle," an "invisible essence," a "central life," as he also calls it, acting the part of an inner *maker* of all that properly makes man, is exposed to every objection that has been taken to the "vital principle"? For, this "pretended explanation," as was well said of the "vital principle," "is a reference, not to anything that we understand better than the object to be explained, but to some-

thing that we do not understand at all,—to something which cannot be received as a deduction of science, but must be accepted as an object of faith." Besides which, does not Dr. Scholten's hypothesis introduce a *new* duality, that of the body and its "formative principle"?

The leading aim of my work, published about three years since, on "The Soul and the Future Life," was to produce such a book, in substance if not in power, as I believed Priestley would have written had he been now living, and had acquainted himself, as he infallibly would have done, with all the additions to science, and especially to *physiological* science, which our age teems with. The reviews of my effort in the current periodicals all betrayed a tacit acceptance of the popular creed, and an utter indisposition to disturb it; not attempting to dispute one of my statements, or to confute one of my arguments. The "Inquirer" honoured me with an equally undemonstrative and non-applying, though, as I familiarly called it, a *slashing* attack; a friend designated it a "savage" one. The reviewer in the "Christian Reformer" was much more courteous, but did not touch the chief points of the question. Will somebody have the goodness to shew an humble follower of Priestley *where* he is wrong?

As regards "Materialism," if it be such to believe that we can have no knowledge beyond that of matter and its properties—the properties of man called his *mental faculties* included—I willingly profess myself a materialist. But then it is perfectly clear that Materialism does not necessarily, as Dr. Scholten seems to think it does, affirm that "everything in inorganic and organic nature is explainable by material combinations in connection with the physical effects of light, heat and electricity;" for I know nothing whatever of the continental chemico-physical theories which he takes so much pains to disprove, and must have acquired my materialism in ignorance of what he views as its basis. I need not add, I trust, that my materialism neither regards man as a non-accountable animal nor denies God. These extremes should be treated *as* extremes, for which the dualism of a body and a soul is properly responsible, just as modern orthodoxy is responsible for much of the infidelity to which it so often leads. *What* my materialism is, my work best shews. And, among other things, it shews, I would fain think, that the human hope of immortality is better founded on the so-called materialism of philosophy, than on the "thing-soul," as Dr. Scholten admits the propriety of calling it, of dualism, though I pretend to derive no "assurance" on this subject from anything but the revelation of Jesus Christ. Further, it shews, or I much mistake, that on the main topic of my book, the nature of the soul, I am not so materialistic as my opponents; for, while I speak of the soul as simply the *spiritual faculties* of a man, they, by making of the faculties a *thing*, or more properly a *being*, cannot but *materialize*, since

we can form no actual conception of *things* or *beings* without investing them, however dimly, however unconsciously, with material attributes. I hope there is no philosopher but knows this, however it may be with such as are incapable of philosophical introspection. Finally, had even the *philosophers* of England, in any marked or known number, arrived at that Priestleian doctrine of the soul which, so far at least as denying dualism, Dr. Scholten shews to be at length making its way on the continent, it is quite certain that my book would never have been written.

THOMAS CROMWELL.

THE NEW EDUCATION MINUTE.*

THE pages of the *Christian Reformer* have always earnestly advocated the cause of popular education and detailed its conspicuous points of progress. Recognizing the right, if not the duty, of the State to promote the elementary education of the poor, we have recorded the progressive steps of the Educational Committee of the Privy Council from its formation in 1839, with sympathy and hopefulness, which, we regret to say, have been continually disappointed in the result. Our advocacy, we feel, has too much resembled the defence of the Church of England by the more enlightened sort of Churchmen, who sustain it because it ought to be very different from what it is. Only our case seemed somewhat more practically hopeful in advocating the principle of State education when all the details had yet to be organized, than that of the Churchman whose advocacy of a great principle implies the laborious effort to undo all existing details.

We confess to continual mortification in tracing the history of the Council of Education. It has left undone so many things that it ought to have done (and which the State alone could do), and done so many things which it ought not to have done (and which the impartiality of the State should have refused), that we must confess on its behalf that there is little or no health in it.

The great argument for State interference is, that it can do what voluntary exertions cannot, especially by reaching the remote and destitute parts of the population in town and country. But how has the Council of Education sustained this claim, which we and many others have advanced on its behalf? By laying it

---

* Minute of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education establishing a Revised Code of Regulations. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of her Majesty. 1861.

Letter to Earl Granville, K.G., on the Revised Code, &c. By Sir James Kay Shuttleworth. 1861.

down as a fundamental rule, that its grants in aid shall be made in proportion to the funds raised in each locality! Thus it helps in proportion as the place can do for itself; the helpless and neglected places are helpless and neglected still, so far as the initiative depends upon the Education Committee of Council.

The great rule for a State aid to education in a free country surely should be to dispense it without regard to anything but educational needs or deserts. In a country of religious sects, the State should, in its capacity of educator, know nothing of religious distinctions. It was perfectly easy from the first to say, "Every school desiring help must open itself to our inspection. It may belong to any religious sect or to none; we do not inquire into any such matters. We observe a strict neutrality as to religious differences. But we must inspect its arrangements for secular instruction and notice their results; and we shall assist or refuse assistance according as these meet or fall short of our standard." It was widely believed that something like this would be the course pursued. At least the clergy of the Churches of England and Scotland made fierce demonstrations against the Government on the supposition that they meant not to take cognizance of the religious instruction given in schools. In an evil hour the Council succumbed; and they have ever since held the anomalous position of trying to provide or sanction religious education of all sorts to please all the sects in turn. And even thus they could not please those who insist upon the absolute necessity of combining sectarian theology with day-school instruction, and then invoke Dissenting principle to reject State education as a virtual religious endowment. The Council has appointed one set of inspectors to look after Church-of-England schools, whose duty it is to examine the religious as well as secular attainments of the children; another set who look after British and Dissenting and "Undenominational" schools, under strict injunction *not* to know anything about the religious instruction; another set, we believe, for the Scotch Presbyterian schools, and another for the Catholics. Another still was offered to the Wesleyans, but we believe they did not require it. The Council has at various times found some difficulty in steering its tortuous course amid its self-created religious difficulties. It propitiated the Wesleyans, in 1847, by a most disgraceful straining of its own minutes so as to exclude the Roman Catholics (whom it has since admitted); and even now it knows no such thing as an Independent, Congregational, Baptist or Unitarian or Jewish school, unless they choose to call themselves "British schools" or "Undenominational schools." To this day it refuses assistance to a *secular* school, however truly religious its spirit may be; and to this day it allows and encourages a mere formal recitation of a verse or two of the Bible as the qualification for receiving State help. A school may be helped if one verse of

the Bible is read every day by master or scholars; otherwise it may not.

Of red tape and blue books there has been no end. Regulations the most needless and complicated fetter the administration of the Parliamentary grant, and the system is almost in danger of falling to pieces by the force of gravitation; as may be judged from Sir J. K. Shuttleworth's sage plea in its defence, that "the work of the central office is infinitely less complicated and heavy than that of the Post-office, or of the Admiralty, or of the several War departments." We confess we had not, till we read this defence, realized the immensity of the abuse that had grown up in so new and comparatively simple a department as the Committee of Education.

This complexity has, we believe, been one great cause of the now attempted simplification of the code. The growing expense of the Education grant is another. The various abortive Education Bills which have made their appearance in the House of Commons during the last ten years (especially at the impulse of the Lancashire Public School Committee), do not seem to have had much influence in the revision. But in 1852, the Government, under considerable pressure from the freer-minded friends of education, promised shortly to take up the subject with a view to its settlement; and in 1856, Lord John Russell laid on the table of the House of Commons some resolutions which seemed to bespeak the intention of doing something, but which were lost on the debate following. On the 30th of June, 1858, however, the Queen issued "a commission to inquire into the present state of popular education in England;" which commission having duly reported, the Lords of the Committee of Privy Council on Education determined to revise the Code of Minutes and Regulations under which the Parliamentary grant is now distributed. This revision is the occasion of no little ferment. Vested interests claim to be protected. Schools once helped must never be less helped than hitherto. Masters whose salaries have been augmented out of the Parliamentary grant, kick at the idea of possible diminution through a different mode of distribution dependent upon "results."

The essence of the new proposal is, to make the amount of the public grant to a school depend, not merely upon the master being certificated and a certain number of scholars being in attendance, but also upon the results as shewn by the attainments of the pupils in "the three *RR*, reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic." At present a certificated master is intitled to a certain augmentation of salary, and also to a fixed payment for teaching his pupil teachers. These and the apprentices are also paid certain small salaries by the Government. And there is also a capitation fee to the master,—so much per head for all scholars who have attended a certain number of times in the year. The Council

now require, by the revised Code, that this *capitation pay* should be contingent upon certain results being shewn and certified by the inspector. Here lies the whole question; and it would seem that nothing could be more reasonable than what is required. There can be no vested rights in a pay which depends upon an annual grant of Parliament. But the Council reserves with due care the conditions of the apprenticeships already begun, and takes upon itself their completion unless released from it by the managers of the individual schools. The annual augmentation of salary can never be a vested right, nor can any teacher fairly or wisely complain of its being rendered contingent upon *results*, as seen in the progress of the pupils. The only fair question is, whether the results required are of *too high a mark;* and if they are so, the remedy is to lower them and not to object to this kind of test. Into this question we do not enter here; but may state, by way of shewing the rate of attainments required, that the children are divided into four groups and tested as follows:

Group 1—Three to seven years of age:

Reading: Narrative in monosyllables.

Writing: Form on black board or slate, from dictation, letters, capital and small, manuscript.

Arithmetic: Form on black board or slate, from dictation, figures up to 20; name at sight figures up to 20; add or subtract figures up to 10, orally, from examples on black board.

Group 2—Seven to nine years of age:

Reading: A short paragraph from an elementary reading-book used in the school.

Writing: A sentence from the same paragraph, slowly read once, and then dictated by single words.

Arithmetic: A sum in any simple rule as far as short division (inclusive).

Group 3—Nine to eleven years of age:

Reading: A short paragraph from a more advanced reading-book used in the school.

Writing: A sentence slowly dictated once by a few words at a time, from the same book, but not from the paragraph read.

Arithmetic: A sum in compound rules (money and common weights and measures).

Group 4—Eleven and upwards:

Reading: A short ordinary paragraph in a newspaper or other modern narrative.

Writing: Another short ordinary paragraph in a newspaper or other modern narrative, slowly dictated once by a few words at a time.

Arithmetic: A sum in practice or simple proportion.

This last is the standard for the *highest form;* for children of eleven and upwards.

We know it to be far, very far, below the standard of many

Lancasterian or British schools. And it seems strange to let the highest classification include all from eleven upwards. It may be true that in multitudes of schools, both in the manufacturing and agricultural districts, the temptation of earning wages takes the chief part of the boys away at twelve and thirteen; but in every good school of average size, there is a class of children (small in numbers perhaps) that can do very much more than is here prescribed. Sir J. K. Shuttleworth (under whom the present system grew) objects, on behalf of the teachers, even to this low standard, by citing the condition of the most unfavourable districts; and we freely grant there is a difficulty in making one standard for all schools. But let a better guage be suggested; do not let the teachers and managers of schools claim to be exempt from the necessity of shewing what has been done.

Our own dissatisfaction with the Revised Code is of a different kind. It leaves all the life-long sins of the Council unacknowledged and unreformed; those which were again and again shewn in Parliament and out during the earnest discussions which occupied men's minds before the Crimean War, and which have never since been allowed the same prominence. The Revised Code (which we do not think Parliament will interfere to prevent being brought into action) will either economize the lately enormous growth of the Education grant, or will bring up the *results* to a higher mark than hitherto. It will also economize red tape to a wonderful extent, and will in the same degree put the details of administration into the hands of the local managers of each school, by voting the whole sum in one amount, instead of persevering in the idle boast of putting every pupil teacher into immediate connection with Her Majesty's Privy Council in the payment of his or her little salary.

But it will do nothing still for the districts that are uncared for by voluntary societies. It will leave the religious difficulty just what the Council itself has needlessly made it. It will work, as hitherto, with immensely preponderating influence in favour of the Church and against the Dissenters and general population. It will repeat the cowardly injustice of refusing help to secular schools, the sham of making schools religious by requiring a verse of the Bible to be read, and the anti-national, invidious ascendancy of the Church Catechism in country districts, where a single school is all that is wanted, and the Government cares not to stipulate that it must be really *national* as the condition of receiving national aid.

We have confined our remarks to the operation of the new Minute upon elementary schools. Its details also apply to normal schools as regulated and helped by the Council of Education.

INTERCOURSE BETWEEN THE UNITARIANS OF TRANSYLVANIA AND GREAT BRITAIN.

It is with much pleasure we publish, in compliance with the wishes of the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, the following letter, recently received by that body from the Bishop and Clergy of the Unitarian church in Transylvania, and also a copy of a letter just transmitted to the same persons, signed by some of the leading Unitarians of England and Scotland, both ministers and laymen, on an important subject intimately connected with religious liberty.

To the Committee of the English and Foreign Unitarian Association, from the Council of the Synod held by the Unitarians of Transylvania in Thorda, in June, 1861.

Our dear Brethren in Christ,

The Council of this year's Synod has received with great pleasure an account of the various measures taken since our last meeting to increase the mutual good feeling between the Unitarians of England and Transylvania. They have been more especially touched with the zeal with which you have adopted and carried into execution the plan for assisting one of our students every year in completing his theological education at the Manchester College, London. To keep up this friendly relation is a great source of rejoicing to us, and no effort shall be wanting on our part to maintain it for the future. The Consistory has expressed itself ready to do its part towards this object, and we are desired to express its thanks, as well as those of the Synod, for your sympathy and interest in our affairs. The Council of the Synod has also desired us to make you acquainted with the result of the deliberations of the late assembly.

According to our ancient custom, the Council of the Synod was usually held every year in turn in one of our eight ecclesiastical districts, to settle the business of the church and to encourage mutual intercourse and goodwill among its members. This year, on June the 30th and two following days, the Synod met at Thorda, one of our most populous parishes. Most of the members arrived the day before, and hastened to pay their respects to the President, when the clergyman of Thorda, Mr. John Albert, offered up a prayer of thanksgiving for the occasion. The solemn opening of the Synod took place next day, commencing, as is our custom, with a religious service. Professor Mr. Joseph Ferencz, second clergyman of the church of Klausenburg, conducted the service, and preached from xviii. chap. of St. Luke, 20 and 21 verses, a sermon, since published, adapted to the occasion. Mr. Mozes Székely, the general notary, then addressed the meeting, and declared the Synod opened, and the ceremony was concluded by the administration of the Communion by Mr. István Kelemen, the clergyman of Izabéd and notary of Maros district. The feeling of satisfaction that we had been again allowed to

meet together was universal, and we congratulated ourselves on the numbers who had attended to shew their interest in the cause of the Unitarian church.

The chief business of the present Synod was the election of a Bishop. Our late Bishop of blessed memory, Mr. Sánolor Székely, died in 1852, and, in spite of the reiterated demands of the Synodal Council, the Austrian Government has up to the present time refused to permit the election of a new Bishop, although this right has been enjoyed by the Unitarians many centuries. At last, through the mediation of the restored Chancery of Transylvania, the consent of the Emperor has been obtained to the exercise of this most undoubted right. The election is made on the most constitutional principles by means of the ballot and by an absolute majority,—the right of choice residing in the lay and clerical members of the Synodal Council, who can elect whom they please, without any other restriction than that the Bishop must be a consecrated clergyman of the Unitarian church. The choice fell on the Rev. John Kriza, first clergyman of Klausenburg, Professor of Theology in the College of Klausenburg, Dean of the district of Kolos-Doboka, and corresponding member of the Hungarian Academy. After addressing the Synod, Mr. Kriza was at once consecrated and sworn into his new office, and immediately entered on his duties, his name being subsequently sent up to his Majesty for confirmation.

The second great object of the Synodal meeting was the consecration of young clergymen, which it is the custom only to perform on these occasions. Professor Mr. Lajos Nagy, second clergyman, conducted the religious service, preaching from the 1 Ep. of Paul to the Thessalonians, chap. v., verses 18 to 21. The new Bishop, Mr. Kriza, then addressed the candidates on the duties of the office they were about to undertake, after which the consecration took place, the Deans laid their hands on the heads of the new pastors, and the Bishop bestowed his blessing and gave them their diplomas authorizing them to exercise their clerical functions. The Dean of Udvarhely, Mr. Joseph Inezefi, concluded the proceedings with a prayer. The prayers and sermons delivered on this occasion were ordered to be printed and copies to be sent to you.

Besides the business we have just related, the chief Synodal Council has to fill up vacancies in the Unitarian church, to elect new members of the Consistory, to revise the accounts, and transact other business connected with the general welfare of the Unitarian community. An interesting part of the business of the meeting was the reading of the correspondences which had taken place with our English brethren, as well that conducted by ourselves as through Mr. Paget. Mr. Tayler's letter to Mr. Mozes Székely and his answer, as well as the appeal from your Committee to the English Unitarians, as inserted in the Inquirer,

was also laid before the meeting, and a vote of thanks passed for the assistance hitherto afforded, and for the intention expressed of rendering permanent the present aid afforded to Mr. Simén to enable a student to pursue his studies at the theological seminary in London. The Synodal Council decides unanimously to grant to Mr. Simén for the present university year the sum of 500 florins Austrian; and that for the future a similar sum should be given annually from the church funds to enable, with the assistance given by you, at least one student always to pursue his studies in London after he has finished them here. After one has resided two years in England, he will return, and another will be sent to take his place. In case at any time, through unforeseen circumstances, our finances should not allow us to carry out this plan for a time, it will be resumed as soon as possible. The Synod has entrusted the Consistory to take the necessary steps for carrying this plan into execution.

You will be pleased to hear that we have established a Professorship of English in the College of Klausenburg. Mr. Aron Buzogány has been appointed Professor, and begins to teach in the present year; and we have great hopes that our students, especially the theological, many of whom have studied English even without assistance, will avail themselves of the opportunity thus afforded, and enrich their minds by the study of English literature.

The Synod took into consideration the changes to be introduced into the general system of education, as, in consequence of the arbitrary arrangement of the late Government, made without a knowledge of our local wants and national habits, it was impossible to go on with our schools as at present constituted. As one example, we need only mention that the history of our own country was a forbidden subject of study. As the right of managing our own affairs in our own way has at last been restored to us, the system of study became one of the first objects of our consideration, and it was determined that a committee should draw up a plan and send it to each parish, that the opinions of the whole body should be taken on it before it was finally laid before the Synod for decision.

An annual publication, the "Keresztény Magveto," "the Christian Sower," containing sermons and essays by Unitarian writers, as well as the lives of eminent Unitarians, has been commenced, and the first vol. has been sent to you by our notary, Mr. Mozes Székely. A zealous member of our Council has offered a prize of ten ducats for the best sermon, which is to be published in the second vol.

The three days during which the Synod was assembled were fully occupied by the great accumulation of business, so that we were generally engaged till late in the night. Happily, the greatest unity prevailed. The Synod was much gratified by

several donations and legacies for the support of churches and schools from zealous members of the Unitarian church. Mr. Andreas Jobbágy, an unmarried man, left the whole of his estate, of the value of 15,000 florins, to the College of Thorda, and thus relieved us in one of our most pressing needs. The state of the College buildings, which so painfully impressed the late Mr. Tagart, have long been a subject of regret, but, thanks to this legacy, we shall be enabled to enlarge and rebuild them very shortly.

We may say without indiscretion that in our prayers you were never forgotten, and in our social meetings, when toasts were drunk and speeches made after the manner of our ancestors, the health and prosperity of the Unitarian church and the welfare of England in general was always received with the greatest enthusiasm.

And now, in conclusion, we ask the blessing of the Almighty on you for the sympathy you have shewed towards the Unitarian cause, and pray that, by working together, each employing the talent given him, we may promote the glory of God and our own immortal happiness.

We remain, with respect, your brethren in faith,

JOANNES KRIZA,
Episcopus Ecclesiarum Unitariarum in Transylvania.
ALEXIUS NAGY DE KAL,
Supremus Curator et a parte seculari Præses.
MOSES PAP,
Notarius S. Consistorii.

To the Very Reverend John Kriza, Bishop of the Unitarians of Transylvania, and the Reverend the Clergy of his Episcopate.

VERY REVEREND SIR AND DEAR BRETHREN,

WE whose names are appended to this letter, Unitarians of Great Britain and Ireland, desire respectfully and affectionately to address you on a subject interesting to us as Christians and as lovers of religious liberty.

It is reported to us by some of our neighbours of the Hebrew race, that in your country and in Hungary their brethren are on account of their faith exposed to civil disabilities, and denied their full share of those privileges which all who obey the laws of a country and share its burthens are entitled to enjoy. We know by experience in our own country how inveterate is popular and religious antipathy to the Jewish race, and how earnest and long-continued the efforts of the friends of civil and religious liberty must be to win for them an equality of civil privilege. In England, Unitarian Christians have felt it a sacred duty to promote the emancipation of their Hebrew fellow-countrymen.

In calling your attention to the condition of the Jews in Transylvania, and in earnestly imploring your help in obtaining

for them equal civil rights with yourselves, we are happy in the belief that you are wholly uninfluenced by the popular antipathy, and that you recognize the inalienable rights of conscience, and are prepared to extend them without distinction to Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Christian. We feel assured that you are worthy descendants of those early Transylvanian Unitarians who nearly three centuries ago were careful to assert and defend religious liberty as well as pure Christianity. Should it now be your happy privilege to assist in the extinction of religious antipathy, and in conferring on the Jews of Transylvania the rights now withheld from them, you will give good proof, alike to Christians and Jews, of your undoubting faith in the religion of the Messiah, and of your being animated by the pure and loving spirit of your Great Master, whose help and prayer were equally ready to bless Gentile and Jew. By justice and generosity you may win the confidence and love of your neighbours of the house of Israel; by such proofs of the spirit and fruits of the religion of Jesus, you may in time lead them to respect and study, and perhaps in the end to accept, the better way of faith in which you and your fathers have walked. There are already signs of movement and a coming change in the Hebrew race. If they are to be led to Christ, it will not be by an abandonment of the worship of the One True God, which Abraham and Moses and Christ equally practised and taught. You and we, representatives and assertors of the central truth common to the Hebrew and Christian faith, may, if faithful and consistent, be the instruments under Providence of conducting some of the race of Israel into the Christian fold.

Very Reverend Sir and dear Brethren, we rejoice in the Christian friendship and intercourse which bind our hearts to yours. Addressing you as we now do under the constraining influence of zeal for religious liberty, and in the spirit of love, we feel assured that you will accept and reply to this letter with fraternal kindness.

We desire, in conclusion, to commend you to the blessing of the One True God, and to a participation in all the best influences and hopes of the religion of Jesus Christ, his beloved Son.

FORCED RELIGION.

You may drag men into church by main force, and prosecute them for buying a pot of beer, and cut them off from the enjoyment of a leg of mutton; and you may do all this till you make the common people hate Sunday, and the clergy, and religion, and everything which relates to such subjects.—Sydney Smith.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED *

A book sufficiently amusing might be written, wholly apart from controversial purposes, on the literary and ecclesiastical history of this famous symbol of faith.

As a daring and successful literary fraud, bearing the name of an author to which it has no probable claim, and for twelve centuries inducing the great mass of Christian believers to repeat it under its fabulous style, it is a subject that will reward the investigations of the curious. Dr. A. Penrhyn Stanley thus sums up the opinions of the learned respecting the authorship of "the ancient Hymn, 'Quicunque Vult,' which throughout the middle ages and by our own Reformers was believed to be the Creed of St. Athanasius:"

"The learned world is now fully aware that it is of French or Spanish origin. It not only contains words and phrases which to Athanasius were unknown, but it distinctly and from the first asserted the doctrine of the double Procession of the Spirit, which never occurs in the writings of Athanasius, and which in all probability he would have repudiated with his Oriental brethren of later times. But its partial resemblance to his style and the assumption of his name have given it an immense support."—*Stanley's Eastern Church*, pp. 290, 291.

It is an illustration of the perplexity of mind which this Creed commonly occasions, that another modern theological writer of not less learning and fairness than the Canon of Christ Church, Dr. Milman, has given a very different account of its conformity to the doctrines of Athanasius. His words are,

"At the close of the controversy (on the Trinity) between the partizans of Arius and Athanasius, *a Latin Creed embodied the doctrines of Athanasius* and of the Anti-Nestorian writers; but even this was not so much a work of controversy, as a final summary of Latin Christianity, as to the ultimate result of the whole. It is the Creed commonly called that of St. Athanasius."—*Latin Christianity*, I. 61, note.

The different reception given to this "ancient Hymn" by different Churches and by members of the same Church, is another curious subject.

Enthusiastically received by the Latin Church, which was first the scholar and then the partizan of Athanasius, it was adopted without hesitation by the Anglican Church. On the other hand, the Eastern Church never chose to recognize it. The Episcopal Church of America has deliberately expunged it from the Prayer Book.

Another curious point in the history of the Creed, and as illustrating, like an Irish quarrel, its power of putting everybody that meddles with it in the wrong, is the fact that, though originally composed in Latin (whether by Hilary, Bishop of Arles,

* The Athanasian Creed. By LL.D. 8vo. Pp. 58. London—Whitfield.

as some conjecture, or in Spain by some later and unknown ecclesiastic, is unimportant), the translation of it in the Anglican Prayer Book is two degrees removed from the original, being not a version direct from the Latin, but by a strange blunder one from a Greek translation of it.

Even in those Churches that have accepted and used this Creed, very different degrees of attachment to it have at various periods been manifested towards it. In the ancient Roman Breviary, it was ordered to be used only on Sundays. But in the Sarum Breviary, it is ordered to be sung daily at the matin service called "Prime." The order of daily prayer in the Anglican Church is taken from the corresponding offices of the Sarum Breviary. When the Reformation came in, a wholesome change was made, the Apostles' Creed being ordinarily substituted for the Athanasian Creed; but the latter was reserved for use, as a kind of highly-spiced theological luxury, on the six great festivals of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost and Trinity. Whether or not the Reformers of 1552, alarmed by the sound of Arian heresy, thought to silence it by a more frequent repetition of the "ancient Hymn," we know not; but certain it is they ordered the Creed to be used in addition at seven of the Saints'-days of the ecclesiastical calendar, so that it should be sung or said at intervals of about a month throughout the year.

When the Commission of 1689 sat on the Prayer Book, one of the subjects discussed by the ten Bishops and twenty Divines who composed it (or as many of them as actually sat), was the continued use and mode of using the Athanasian Creed. As to what took place on this subject, different accounts have come down to us. Nicholls, in his "Apparatus," &c., says that the Commission decided that it should be left to the judgment of the minister to exchange the Athanasian for the Apostles' Creed. But here Bishop Short declares Nicholls to be wrong, and the evidence now in our hands seems to favour the Bishop's statement. Calamy tells us that, lest the rejection of the Creed should be imputed to the Commissioners as an act favouring Socinianism, it was resolved to keep the Creed, but to make a rubric on it declaring the curses denounced therein not to be restrained to every particular article, but intended against those that denied the substance of the Christian religion in general.

But on this subject we now have more certain information. By the well-timed and successful motion of Mr. James Heywood in Parliament (March 14, 1854), an address to the Crown was resolved upon, praying for a copy of the alterations in the Book of Common Prayer prepared by the Commissioners of 1689. The Archbishop of Canterbury very properly gave access to the papers at Lambeth, and a transcript was made by Rev. W. H. Black, which was without delay made public through the press.

Of this document a most convenient edition, edited by Mr.

John Taylor, was published in 1855 by Bagster and Sons. From the editor's Introduction we quote a passage or two which well deserve attention:

"The Commissioners of 1689 reduced the reading of the Athanasian Creed to the same number of days in the year (six), though not the same days, as those which were appointed for it in the First Book of Common Prayer, 1549. They endeavoured also to remove the Objections which are commonly entertained against the *Condemning Clauses*, by representing that they 'are to be understood as relating only to those who obstinately deny the Substance of the Christian Faith.' Had they been aware that the Passage in Mark (xvi. 16), from which these Clauses receive their support and authority, is not found in the earliest known MS. of the New Testament in Greek,—the celebrated Vatican MS. No. 1209,—they would perhaps have doubted whether it ought to be read even on those days. Few persons, who think much upon the subject, are quite satisfied with repeating the whole of the Creed; yet a Creed should be that in which the whole Congregation may join. If this unity is not possible, the next best course that can be taken is, to omit the public reading of a Creed which gives rise to so much difference of opinion.

"The Vatican MS. omits all the verses in the 16th of Mark, after verse 8. The Canons of Eusebius omit the same verses; for which reason Cardinal Cajetan, quoted by Wetstein, judiciously observed: 'Whatever may be the truth in this matter, the effect of these suspicions is, that this paragraph is not of solid authority for confirming Faith, as all the other parts of St. Mark, which are indubitable.' When Archbishop Secker said, in Vindication of these condemning Clauses, 'our Condemnation is no more hard and uncharitable than our Saviour's is at Mark xvi. 16,' he did not know that he relied on a passage of Scripture which is of such very questionable Authority. It was not till near the end of the last Century that the Christian World was generally apprized of the doubts thrown on the authenticity of these concluding Verses of St. Mark's Gospel, by their omission from the most ancient Greek Text extant."

Lord Macaulay has informed the public that Burnet, Fowler and Tillotson, desired to strike the Athanasian Creed out of the Liturgy altogether; and some excellent clergymen have since echoed the wish. But the Creed has been—it is still—tenaciously retained and cherished in the Church, although on very different grounds. Some accept both the statement of doctrine and the damnatory clauses literally and unhesitatingly. They assert that it is true, accordant with scripture and necessary to put down heresy. They care nothing for its unreasonableness or its harshness. With some of them, the unquestioning acceptance of manifestly unreasonable propositions is an exercise of loyal and submissive faith. Like Lord Eldon, they do not complain of there being some things hard to believe; they wish there were more, that their docile faith might be still more manifest. Such are exceptional men, but they are to be found. Others take the Creed with modifications and regrets,—think something of the kind necessary to repress the daring innovations of heresy,—but

confess themselves perplexed and unable to reconcile the doctrine with reason, and some of the propositions of the Creed with scripture. Thus Bishop Mant, in his well-known Notes to the Book of Common Prayer, though courageously enough defending the Creed, admits that there are several things in it beyond our comprehension, and that there are expressions which may seem liable to exception; and further declares that it is not the province of men to judge their brethren or decide their condition in the next world, if through want of information, weakness of apprehension or other causes, they fail to believe Christianity or Christian doctrine. The Bishop of Llandaff (Charge, 1833) probably glanced in part at the Athanasian Creed when he said, in reference to the Prayer Book, "Lapse of time has rendered some phrases obsolete or strange or improper; condemnation of heretical opinions may have been expressed in stronger terms than is necessary or convenient." But no opinion can be found among Churchmen on the subject of this Creed more weighty than that of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. In his fine discourse on the "Liberty of Prophesying," that great man, while pleading for the expediency of articles and symbols of faith, confesses that if questioned concerning the Creed of Athanasius, he cannot see that moderate sentence and gentleness of charity in his preface and conclusion that appeared in the Nicene Creed.

"*Nothing there but damnation and perishing everlastingly, unless the Article of the Trinity be believed as it is there with curiosity and minute particularities explained.*" * * * "For the Articles themselves, I am most heartily persuaded of the truth of them, and yet I dare not say all that are not so are irrevocably damned."

Then the good Bishop hints that belief in the Apostles' Creed is sufficient for baptism, and sufficient therefore for salvation. As to the Creed of Athanasius, "*how many people understand it not, how contrary to natural reason it seems, how little the Scripture says of those curiosities of explication, and how tradition was not clear on his side for the Article itself, much less for those forms and minutes.*" Supposing such sentences were published now-a-days by some Anglican Bishop, and he were cited before the Court of Arches and Dr. Lushington were the Judge, we know not, however distasteful the duty, that he could refrain from decreeing the Bishop of Connor and Down guilty of publishing doctrine at variance with the Book of Common Prayer, and especially of depraving the Creed commonly called that of St. Athanasius.

But we cannot part with the Bishop without further adducing his authority as to the mischief to the Church done by this unsparing symbol:

"All the world in factions, all damning one another, each party damned by all the rest; and there is no disagreeing in opinion from any

man that is in love with his own opinion, but damnation presently to all that disagree. * * * Nothing more furious than a mistaken zeal, and the actions of a scrupulous and abused conscience. When men think everything to be their faith and their religion, commonly they are so busy in trifles and such impertinences in which the scene of their mistake lies, that they neglect the greater things of the law, charity and compliances, and the gentleness of Christian communion; for this is the great principle of mischief, and yet is not more pernicious than unreasonable."

One other authority on the subject of this Creed is an Irish Bishop, a century nearer to us than Bishop Taylor, Dr. Robert Clayton, Bishop of Clogher. The passage we are about to quote is from his noted speech on Subscription to Articles and Creeds, spoken Feb. 2, 1756, in the Irish House of Lords. After speaking of the symbol as a probable forgery, he proceeds to remark that, even if its authenticity could be proved,

"There are still more objections against it than are to be urged against the Nicene Creed. For as it searches and mines further into that which is not revealed than even the Nicene Creed does, it is so much the more faulty as a Creed, which ought to contain nothing that is not plainly and clearly revealed in the Scriptures. * * * It contains a doctrine of so nice, so disputable and metaphysical a nature, as is hardly fit to be treated on in the schools; but is, I am certain, by no means sufficiently revealed to be made the subject of a Creed, which is commanded by public authority to be read by the minister and repeated by the people in the public service of the Church, where the low as well as the high are ordered to assemble themselves, and which should be, according to St. Paul, not to doubtful disputations, but that they may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Supposing the doctrine of the Creed to be true, the Bishop goes on to say:

"Can any one, nevertheless, justify these damnatory clauses, which in a point of so disputable a nature and of so difficult a determination, so positively assert that 'every one who does not keep this faith whole and undefiled shall without doubt perish everlastingly.' * * * Hard words, and seemingly unfit for the mouth of a Christian and a Protestant."

Then naming the contrary supposition that the doctrine is false, the Bishop proceeds:

"Let us consider what would be the consequence. I dread to name it, as it would be no less than blasphemy; for if the Father and the Son have not from all eternity been consubstantial and co-equal, the assertion of that proposition would be blasphemy. * * * It is the dread and terror of a wrong determination, in a point of so delicate a nature, that makes me solicitous for having this Creed removed out of our Liturgy. And in a matter of such great consequence, and where the honour of God the Father is so nearly concerned, I own that I am fearful how I put any other being or person upon a level with him."

These were sensible words, but somewhat bold on the lips of

a Bishop. They, together with some similar speculations, cost their author his peace of mind, if not his life. There were in that day some who thought that free inquiry should be carried on by free inquirers, and as they did not class with them an Anglican Bishop, they resolved to issue a process against Bishop Clayton. The day was fixed for the trial, but ere it arrived the defendant, exhausted by excitement and mortification at the defamation to which he was exposed, had ceased to breathe.

It might not be without its use were we to adduce further varieties of opinion respecting this celebrated Creed on the part of those who subscribe and use it, from Waterland down to Mr. Maurice. Already, however, sufficient diversities have been manifested to prove the deceptiveness and the worthlessness of the plea sometimes put forth in behalf of articles and creeds, that they create and secure *uniformity of faith.*

It must in candour be admitted that, if the subscribers of the Creed have differed in their interpretation and estimate of this symbol of faith, its opponents have not been always agreed in their views respecting it.

Some, little versed in ecclesiastical history, and thus disqualified from putting a natural interpretation on ecclesiastical documents, have imagined that the author of the Athanasian Creed was a wily heretic, whose object in drawing it up was to expose the unreasonableness of the doctrine it embodies and the absurdity of the orthodox theory respecting three Persons in one God. Others, not receiving it as the work of a conscious enemy of the orthodox faith, have supposed the author designed to express in the strongest way he could the divorce of reason from faith, and that therefore he put orthodoxy into a series of propositions which, logically regarded, are so many contradictions in terms, at which, if faith do not falter, reason stands aghast.

Others, willing to give the author of the Creed credit for good faith, have supposed that, finding himself unwillingly swept away by the irresistible current of Trinitarian dogmas towards Tritheism, he made a desperate effort to get back to Monotheism. They further suppose that, having been used to the daring habits of a Church which never professed to regard the reasonableness of its doctrines as an argument for their acceptance, the author of the Athanasian Creed did not allow his mind to be troubled by the fact, that while his premisses manifestly led to a particular result, the conclusions drawn by himself were directly the opposite.

According to this theory, never were more dangerous polemics practised. Even with the docile submission of the Latin Church, the danger was not inconsiderable; but when the Creed was introduced into the Liturgy of a Church which professed to recognize and respect the rights of private judgment, the danger to faith was increased a hundredfold.

Whether the so-called Creed of St. Athanasius has been the means of keeping any considerable number of persons in the pale of orthodoxy, is more than we know; but, on the other hand, we know there have been cases in which its defiant dogmas have set men a-thinking, and the result of their inquiries has been a total abandonment of the doctrine of the Trinity, as inconsistent in all its various forms with the Unity of God.

We have left ourselves far less space than we designed to the latest writer on this Creed, who designates himself by the suggestive letters "LL.D." Although we have a shrewd suspicion respecting the real author, and believe that his name would, if published, greatly enhance the interest of the work, we shall respect the anonymous character he has assumed, and content ourselves with recommending the treatise on the ground of its actual, essential characteristics. These are, if we have read it aright, vigorous sense, a firm retention of the great doctrines of scripture, and gigantic strength in cleaving in twain unscriptural proofs and sophistical arguments. The style is brilliant, though profuse; the phraseology is sometimes highly poetical, but the ideas are nervous to the last degree. The framework is hung with garlands and decked with jewels, but the painting itself shews the simple power of a master's hand. We are persuaded that no Trinitarian of intellectual habits could sit down to this work without having his mind for a time entirely possessed by it. Should he wish to reply to its reasonings, we do not envy him his task.

A brief description of the plan of this treatise, and one or two quotations to illustrate the author's manner and argument, are all that we can further attempt in this article.

He begins by telling us that he had just been listening to this "orthodox malediction." The fact that it "is made the Church coronal of the holiest days" of the ecclesiastical year, while rousing amazement and displeasure, has also supplied him with weapons wherewith to open the attack on the Creed. He specifies the Festivals and Saints'-days on which the rubric directs the Creed to be said or sung, and detects in its clauses or spirit a palpable and harsh discord, spoiling the sweet and mutual harmony of scripture and apostles and saints.

Two of the days, he admits, are not inappropriate to the Creed. We go with him in respect to Trinity Sunday. The Creed is worthy of the day, "a Sabbath certainly not instituted by Moses or the prophets, or Jesus or his apostles." Bartholomew, however, is not responsible for the crimes and persecutions, the ejections and the massacres, which cruel or wicked men have perpetrated on the day marked in the Church calendar by his name. With fervid and indignant eloquence, our author denounces the association of a fierce Creed with Christmas, a day ushered in by angels' smiles, a day of grace and truth, a day whose history tells

us of a mother and a babe, of the feebleness and suffering of humanity, not of the passionless immutability of Omnipotence.

"Next comes the Epiphany, the manifestation of Christ to unbelievers." Christ came to reveal God's forgiveness. The Creed reveals a fierce and unforgiving God. Why next was St. Matthias chosen? Matthias in the Acts is chosen to bear witness to the resurrection. In the Creed there are 699 words; of these, only eight touch on the resurrection. Easter and Ascension were days that proclaimed life and heaven; the Athanasian Creed teaches the doctrine of death, everlasting death, and hell.

Whitsunday. Why read this bad Creed on that bright cosmopolitan festival? The cloven tongues breathed out no maledictions. They did not like the angry passions which dictated the Creed, scorch and destroy the heads on which they lighted. And why, our author asks, is St. John the Baptist involved in the dogmas of the Creed? His doctrine was redemption, remission of sins, and the tender mercies of God.

On the day of St. James, too, the Creed is to be read. The James of the New Testament said men should be slow to wrath, and his doctrine was that *faith* could not without works save. This is not the doctrine of the Creed. The Athanasian Creed points out a royal road to heaven, but it runs not parallel with such a royal law as James proclaimed.

St. Matthew is the only evangelist on whose day the Creed is to be used. Does that evangelist countenance the doctrine of the Creed? Did he divide the world into believers and non-believers of the mystery of the Trinity? Matthew did not describe the makers and the repeaters of this Creed as those blessed of the Father. No reason can be given why St. Simon, St. Jude and St. Andrew should be specially identified with a Creed of which, as to its letter and spirit, they were wholly guileless.

In the next place, our author analyzes the rubric which heads this Creed in the Prayer Book, and pungently comments on the words ordering the substitution of this for the Apostles' Creed. Then follow thirty pages of analysis of the Creed itself, pages full of glowing eloquence, contrasting the mysterious doctrine of the Creed with the simple, soul-strengthening teachings of Christ and his apostles,—its hard and cruel spirit with their gentle tones of peace, breathing blessings all around.

As a specimen of the criticisms on the dogmas of the Athanasian Creed, take the passage on the co-eternity and co-equality of the three Persons of the Trinity:

"The three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal. In all the representations of the Trinity which I have ever seen or heard, no such equality is ever preserved. No! the Father towers supreme. The idea of equality never has, never can penetrate the mind. It is repelled, it is rejected, at the first moment of its presentation. The word *co-equal* may be repeated ten thousand times; the idea of equality never *will*

obtain possession of the heart or the understanding. Jesus will be the express Image of his Father's person, but not *the person;* the brightness of his Father's glory, but not *the glory;* the instrument by which the earth and heavens were created, but not *the creator;* the future Judge of all men, but *appointed* thereto by his Father; the Saviour, but *the sent* to save; the Comforter, but the appointed to comfort. All is subjection, all is subordination. But as regards the third entity in the Trinity, 'co-eternal and co-equal,' wearisome indeed would be the search for any separate mission confided to this portion or person of the Trinity."—P. 47.

Here is our author's criticism on the mystery of the Incarnation:

"God! the Cause of all causes, the Creator of all creatures, the Light of all lights, the Filler of all space, the Depository of all knowledge, the Consolidation of all power, all love, all beauty,—invisible, yet everywhere present,—seeing all, directing all, pervading all,—an omnipresent Now midst ages gone and ages dawning and decaying,—the fluttering of an insect's wing or the rolling of ten thousand worlds alike directed by the infinite Omniscience,—all, and in all and over all,—in whose presence millions of suns are but as the dust at our feet,—whose attributes are as much beyond our conception as is the motion of the earth to the mole beneath his mound:—this is the God who, according to the Athanasian Creed, was transformed into a man 'born in the world,' among horses in a stable's manger,—a crying child, nursed at a woman's breast, playing with carpenter's tools, disputing with rabbis in the temple, suffering with the suffering, mourning over the dead, supplicating for aid, condemned for sedition, dying on a cross, buried in a tomb, and ascending *bodily* to heaven."—P. 49.

One other passage describes the spirit of the Creed:

"This Creed is utterly pitiless. For human infirmity it has no indulgence,—for weakness of intellect, for incapacity to weigh evidence, for the effects of education, habit, prejudice; it is inexorable; its *shall* and *will* are autocratically despotic; 'before all things it is necessary to hold' the doctrines of this tyrannical Creed; without doubt, if he do not, he shall 'perish everlastingly.' If he will be saved, he must—O absolute and irresistible *must!*—he must thus—exactly *thus*—think of the Trinity. But was there ever a more melancholy exhibition of the darkest ignorance of the construction and philosophy of the human mind? Does not every man, who has passed the threshold of the earliest elements of thought—does he not know that there are shades of belief and shades of doubt, and that men do not think or believe exactly alike on the commonest subjects, even on those in which they have the evidence of their senses, where they can see and hear and touch and taste and smell? Do they agree with respect to matters most present and most palpable? But as regards the most difficult, the most distant, the most profound, the most exalted, they are called upon—called upon under the pain and penalty of eternal punishment, the menace of never-ending agonies—not only to believe, or say they believe, but to hurl maledictions at all who doubt or disbelieve.

"Doubt!—is there not often something *sacred*, something religious, in doubt—in honest, fearful, trembling doubt? Is doubt the visitor of the thoughtful, of the pure, of the pious? Are those who most loudly pro-

claim their own orthodoxy, and most violently censure and condemn the want of orthodoxy in others—are they the most distinguished for the exercise of the Christian virtues? Is not forbearance one of them? Is not forgiveness another? Is not charity of the number? How forbearing, how forgiving, how charitable is this Creed! It is a cup of the bitterest bitters; it is a night of the thickest darkness; it is a code of laws compared to whose brutality nothing is found recorded in the history of ignorance, presumption and folly."—Pp. 28, 29.

Agreeing with our author in all he has said in derogation of this harsh symbol, the blot of the English Liturgy, the one stigma of the national Church of England, we are ready to say with him, "Happy will be the day for the Church itself when this Creed is torn out from the Book of Common Prayer, and condemned as he is condemned who calleth his brother, Raca!"

When will that day come? The signs of the times do not encourage the hope of its speedy advent. Our own desire on the subject is free from every taint of fear. The "curse causeless" lights not on our head. But as Englishmen, desiring from a pure love of our country its welfare and dignity, we cannot but desire that a Creed discreditable to any national Church should be abolished. As Christians, earnestly desirous for the diffusion of religion pure and undefiled, we may surely wish that a Creed so impure in its doctrine and so defiled by presumption and uncharitableness, may be as quickly as possible forgotten.

THE LATE ELHANAN BICKNELL—IN MEMORIAM.

The year 1861, now closed, is one which will not be soon forgotten. Its annals will be associated with some irretrievable losses, and with sorrows of which the scars will in some hearts be obliterated only with the cessation of life.

The Unitarian church has had its portion of the general loss and sorrow. Of the ministers of our religious faith who have passed away, our pages have contained or will hereafter give a sufficiently full record. Of their laymen, Unitarians may well be proud. Some that have lately passed to their reward well deserve our reverential sorrow. It is always matter of regret when their recorded wishes, prompted by a too sensitive humility, put a restraint on the public expression of regard and forbid all biographical details.

The Unitarian body have not often lost a more ardent friend or a more liberal helper than the late John Watson. A kinder and warmer heart than that of the late George Kirkpatrick does not beat in many living men. Much more that we fain would say is repressed. But it is well for society that the tongue or the pen of surviving friendship is sometimes allowed free scope in relation to the departed good. Of William Fisher, the enlightened friend of civil and religious liberty, our obituary columns contain a record.

Elhanan Bicknell's recent death makes a serious and long-to-be-

regretted void in the Unitarian church. He was a man of genial temper, of high and noble principles, one that sought and loved truth with his whole soul, and who thought no sacrifices too great in its behalf. His tastes were highly cultivated and always pure. His religious opinions were clear and decided, and affected the whole tenor of his thoughts and life. His zeal never flagged and never degenerated into bigotry. With the bad feeling which that word embodies, it was not possible that his kind heart could be tainted. His character, in short, was an instructive and pleasing comment on the religion, pure and undefiled, intelligent and catholic, which he had by individual thought gained from the study of the Bible.

His personal history, though it does not contain many striking incidents or affecting vicissitudes, will be perused not without satisfaction by all who knew the sterling worth of the man. He was one of that numerous class in England who by their industry and integrity win the way to large wealth. His father having given him a name untainted by reproach, set him an example worthy of imitation, and by his conduct as well as his precepts made him understand the value of religion and scripture truth.

William, the father of Elhanan Bicknell, was a schoolmaster of good repute, successively in Southwark, Ponder's End, Middlesex, and at Tooting, in Surrey. One of his pupils, and a schoolfellow of his son, was Thomas Wilde, first an attorney, then a distinguished barrister on the Western circuit, and ultimately, with the title of Lord Truro, Lord Chancellor. William Bicknell's closest personal friend was Elhanan Winchester, the distinguished advocate of the doctrine of Universal Restoration, the writer, indeed, who first in any degree popularized that doctrine in England. When Mr. Winchester published his book on Universal Restoration, Mr. Bicknell took the risk of the work, and his name was entered as its owner at Stationers' Hall. He disposed of portions of the venture to other friends of the author; but before the work reached its second edition, he and they gave up the property to Mr. Winchester, that he might receive a full reward for his labour and talent. The following letter, written about November, 1789, shews the writer's high estimation of Mr. Winchester and his books:

"Dear Sir,—With pleasure I resign for your benefit a work which has afforded me more comfort and satisfaction than any yet published, only excepting that *mine* from whence it originated. I never expect to see it surpassed, except by the Lectures, in our language. And I think it will stand, with the Lectures, as a record to succeeding ages of the additional light that it has pleased our gracious Benefactor to bestow in these days through your instrumentality.

"Farewell, and enjoy the fruit of your labours. And may God of his infinite mercy so water the good seed that has been sown in this land by your means, that it may bring forth a plentiful harvest in our lives and practice, is the daily prayer of your friend in the real gospel, W. Bicknell."

Another valued friend of Mr. Bicknell was Rev. William Vidler, afterwards the popular minister at Parliament-Court chapel, London. To him there is an allusion in a letter addressed by Winchester to William Bicknell:

"September, 1793.

"Mr. Vidler, of Battle, supplied my place two Sundays during my absence, and gave universal satisfaction. He and his church have lately been cast out

of their connection for holding the doctrine of the Universal Restoration, of which he is a most able defender.

"I have just reprinted 'The Outcasts Comforted,' chiefly on his account, and have dedicated this third edition to him and to his people."

William Bicknell's son was born at Ponder's End, Dec. 21, 1788, and received the name of ELHANAN as a mark of his father's respect for Elhanan Winchester. His father gave him a sound education, and then he was sent into a distant part of the country, with a view of acquiring a practical knowledge of agriculture, to which it was intended that he should devote himself. It was amid the pleasing scenery of the county of Salop, and especially in the neighbourhood of the county town, the market of which at this period he was accustomed to attend, that he derived the taste for the picturesque, and particularly for the quiet beauty of rustic subjects, which remained a portion of his being to the end of life.

He did not carry into effect his purpose of farming, but when about twenty years of age returned to London. Here he engaged in business, forming a partnership with Mr. Langton as an oil merchant and a refiner of spermaceti. The latter branch of their business originated with Mr. Langton's father, to whom the credit is due of inventing a process which, figuratively speaking, turned into gold what had previously been regarded as mere waste and a nuisance. The sediment of sperm oil was till then supposed to be useless, and was at some expense carted away, and was, together with other substances of which imperfect science had failed to detect the use and value, thrown a noxious sediment into the Thames, the great sewer of London.

The business at Newington Butts, where Mr. Bicknell conducted it for fifty years, was rewarded by success equal to all his wants, and which enabled him to gratify the impulses of his generous heart.

Mr. Bicknell was not content to be the man of business only, however great the success which in its conduct he achieved. He was from early life a reader and a thinker, and no subjects more engrossed his attention than the meaning of scripture and the scope of divine revelation. Advancing, and in early life, considerably beyond the opinions of his father, he embraced the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity, and held them to the last hour of consciousness with a firm grasp, and experienced from them all the holiest and most consolatory influences of religion. He was not one of those selfish religionists who think truth a good thing for themselves, but care not whether other men participate in its benefit. He loved to converse and to correspond with friends of different sects on the truths he valued. His well-informed mind and firmly-settled faith enabled him to enter the lists in these theological tournaments even with knights of the orthodox pulpit of high repute. It need, however, not surprise any one that the combatants generally ended as they began. He had, indeed, the singular satisfaction of bringing his worthy father before the close of life to the adoption of the Unitarian faith. To one who had renounced Calvinism for Universalism, the advance was not difficult.

The extent of Mr. Bicknell's generosity to religious objects is well known; how frequent and valuable his gifts in other directions were, few, if any, fully know.

He was one of those who offered the liberal guarantee which in the

year 1817 induced Mr. W. J. Fox, on leaving Chichester, to settle with the congregation then worshiping at Parliament Court. He afterwards contributed liberally to the new chapel at South Place, and at a later period, in conjunction with the late Mr. John Travers and others, he united in building the chapel at Brixton. His recent munificent gifts and subscriptions to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association will be in the recollection of all our readers. Mr. Bicknell, notwithstanding his heartfelt interest in Unitarianism, shrunk from all unnecessary publicity, and declined those offices of honour which are generally not unacceptable to the wealthy and the prosperous.

Mr. Bicknell greatly loved country scenes; and although he resided at so short a distance from the metropolis, possessed grounds of considerable extent, admirably laid out, and adorned with the choicest flowers, plants and trees. His skill in landscape gardening was considerable; and as he possessed and lived on his estate at Herne Hill about forty years, it grew, with its conservatories and other appliances, to be noted for its beauty. In the period of his declining strength, he found great solace in his grounds; and when no longer able to walk, was wheeled about, and superintended the alterations and improvements which his taste suggested. Another characteristic of Mr. Bicknell was his pure love of art. His house was a picture-gallery and a museum of sculpture. Here the great works of the modern masters, chosen with the nicest art, were collected and skilfully arranged. Of the works of Turner, his collection was admirable. Not merely artists and students, but persons of cultivated taste generally, were liberally admitted to inspect his treasures. In selecting pictures, he generally chose representations of nature—sweet rural scenes—rather than historical subjects and works of high art. To the very close of life he found in the pictures and other works which he had gathered around him the purest pleasure. In his domestic life, Mr. Bicknell was the centre of habitual peace and happiness. He was married more than once. The mother of Mr. Henry S. Bicknell, who inherits many of his father's tastes and habits, was a daughter of the late Mr. Benjamin Scott Jones, who was during life a liberal supporter of all Unitarian institutions.

During the greater part of the last year, Mr. Bicknell's health declined. At Midsummer he released himself from the cares of business, and made those final arrangements which justice and prudence demand from the head of a family. His ailments grew in number and urgency, but they ever found him patient and prepared. A week or two before his death, he expressed to the son already named his conviction that he had entered on his last sickness, and that it would not be of long continuance, and he avowed his determination to complete at once the arrangements he intended to make. His weakness perceptibly increased, and a few days before his release a slight fall compelled him to keep his bed. He did not rise again, but, with peaceful composure and a mind self-possessed, awaited his dismission. It came on the 27th of November, and was as calm and hopeful as the latter end of a Christian should be. His earthly remains were interred in the cemetery at Norwood, and the last words of affection and sorrow were spoken over his grave by a friend whom he always honoured, the Rev. Thomas Madge. We need not add that they were such as became the Christian pastor mourning a worthy friend, or that they were uttered with his accustomed grace and feeling.

The sorrow of his family has been alleviated by more than the ordinary amount of sympathy. A gentleman well known in commerce and Parliament thus wrote on hearing of Mr. Bicknell's death:

"Your dear father has left behind him the well-earned reputation of having been for nearly half a century a most truthful and honourable British merchant. There are few men so qualified by time and experience to speak of him as myself. For more than thirty years I have had the pleasure of his acquaintance and friendship, and during that long period I have seen him placed in positions of great trial, where men of less principle would have succumbed to temptation; but rising above all worldly considerations, he has never deviated from the path of integrity and honour. * * * There is no greater test of vital religion than those duties which devolve upon us in our daily occupation. This test, severe as it sometimes is, never proved too severe for him."

This and similar tributes of respect have been spontaneously offered by friends who had no sympathy with Mr. Bicknell's religious opinions. The fact shews what a good man may do in overcoming the prejudice that may prevail against his creed.

HYMN.

BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.

On light beams flowing from above,
Man's course of mortal being runs;
And with the loadstone of his love
The Eternal Sire attracts his sons.

What an entrancing sight for him
The enraptured prophet, when his eye
Saw Cherubim and Seraphim
Descending from their native sky!

Ten thousand indications given
Console us in our life's career;
They link us more and more with heaven,
And will at last conduct us there.

The working of celestial love,
In this bright consummation lies,—
It brings down angels from above,
It raises mortals to the skies.

Howe'er on earth we rove or roam,
From heaven we came, to heaven we tend;
Heaven is our final happy home,
Where joys begin and sorrows end.

OBITUARY.

Dec. 14, at Windsor Castle, in the 43rd year of his age, H.R.H. Albert, Duke of Saxony, Prince of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, Knight of the Order of the Garter, and the beloved Consort of Victoria, Queen of England. The illness of the Prince was short, and was only made public within a few days of its fatal termination. The shock of grief which this unlooked-for event occasioned, seemed for a time to paralyze the heart of the nation. Sorrow more spontaneous, sincere and universal, was probably never witnessed. The sound of lamentation has been heard alike from the press and the pulpit, in the mansions of the noble and in the cottages of the poor. Many motives have inspired and prolonged the national emotion. The talents, accomplishments and virtues of the Prince, the relation in which he stood to our beloved Queen and to the Royal Princes and their sisters, and the long series of public services which he has rendered, would under any circumstances have made his death the occasion of national sorrow. But to these sources of grief must be added (as has been truthfully told by the press) the nation's consciousness of not having done justice to the Prince during his life. It is one of the results of an insular position that we look at foreigners with a doubtful and somewhat jealous eye. The characters of Princes have not generally conciliated to them much personal regard. From these causes it came to pass that the Prince, when he assumed the distinguished place assigned him by the pure affection and wise choice of the Queen of England, met with but a cold reception from the nation. The income accorded to him by Parliament was cut down from the original estimate proposed by the responsible advisers of the Crown, to one sufficient (as the result has proved) for his actual wants, but scarcely such as, all circumstances considered, it became a great nation to offer. But to the honour of Prince Albert, he lived within his income, and by a prudent use of his means was enabled both to sustain in a suitable manner his august office as Prince Consort, and to give a large, though never profuse, patronage to literature and art, and to take his right place in public institutions and private charities. Had the Prince, after a few years' residence among us, appealed to the nation to pay his debts, the result would probably have been a large addition to his income. What respect is due to his memory, that for more than twenty years he set to the Royal Family and to the nation a becoming example of just frugality and wise liberality! The whole life of the Prince Consort has been as if there were no special difficulties and temptations in the path of Royalty. To the Queen, his respect and affection have been rendered with unfaltering loyalty. To the younger members of the Royal Family, he has been a wise, accomplished and loving Father. His public duties have been performed with singular exactitude and ability. He never appeared before the public without doing the work which called him personally into their view with delicate tact and invariable success. Whether he undertook to promote some work of charity or some great scheme of social economy, or to take his place among the friends and students of science, his words and acts never fell below the occasion. The wisdom of the Prince appeared as much in what he declined as in what he undertook. He never gave occasion to constitutional or personal distrust, by interfering in business that lay out of his province, or by assuming authority not conceded to him. It was right and proper that he should be, as the Queen's closest friend, next to her Ministers her habitual counsellor. And what honour is reflected on the judgment and loyalty of the Prince by the policy of the Government during the last twenty years! To Queen Victoria, the people of these islands gratefully say,

"Thy name has chronicled a long bright page
Of England's story."

How much of that glory has been owing to the wisdom and loyalty of the Prince Consort, a future age may know, but we can only surmise.

The sorrow of the people at the Prince's death has not been selfishly confined to the consideration of their own public loss. A tender sympathy for the Queen and the Royal children has mingled with the feelings of all. The life of the Queen and the late Prince Consort was so beautiful a picture of love and duty, that we have habitually regarded her as a Wife and a Mother quite as much as a Queen. Therefore it is that her subjects think and feel in relation to her bereavement as they would towards a personal friend visited with some great sorrow. To her we may apply, with a slight alteration, the lines of Mrs. Barbauld addressed to her Royal Grandfather under a sorrowful visitation of a different kind:

"Thou hast human feelings; * * *
* * * And kindly charities,
Even such as warm the cottage hearth, are thine;
And therefore falls the tear from eyes not used
To gaze on kings with admiration fond.
And thou hast knelt at meek Religion's shrine
With no mock homage, and hast owned her rights
Sacred in every breast; and therefore rise
Affectionate, for thee, the orisons
And mingled prayers alike from vaulted domes
Whence the loud organ peals, and raftered roofs
Of humbler worship. Still remembering this,
A nation's pity and a nation's love
Linger beside thy couch, in this the day
Of thy sad visitation."

The relation in which the deceased Prince stood to the Heir Apparent, makes his death at this time a great calamity to the nation. It was the natural expectation and hope of the people that his paternal influence and large experience would safely guide the Prince of Wales at the most critical period of his life through the snares and dangers to which he is exposed. This hope is by an inscrutable decree of Providence disappointed. May the young Prince, in sympathy with his widowed Mother and her sorrowing people, relieve every apprehension and confirm every hope by walking in the steps of his honoured and lamented Father!

THE LATE WILLIAM FISHER, ESQ., OF SHEFFIELD.

Many of our readers will have seen with regret the announcement of the death of this gentleman, whose stately and genial presence will long be remembered by those who have visited the Sheffield congregation, and whose name was still more widely known as an earnest and liberal contributor to various objects connected with our churches, and as one of the veteran race of reformers who are fast disappearing from among us.

From the time of Charles I., the name of Fisher has been one of the old Sheffield names. In the same quiet, old-fashioned court—once, as its name, "Orchard Place," denotes, a green and pleasant nook—off one of the narrower streets in the centre of the town, Mr. Fisher's family have for 200 years carried on the business, which they still pursue there, of scale-pressers and ivory merchants. Mr. Fisher retired from active business some few years ago, but to the day of his death he used to go down to the old spot, and put on his apron—he was proud of his apron, which he said the young men of the present day were getting too fine to wear—and talk to the workmen and see all that was going on. He was there the day before he died, and one of his last acts was to send a "fairing" to the children of one of his old servants, many of whom had been about the place for forty or fifty years. In the first half of last century, James and Dorothy Fisher were living there, the grand-parents of the late William Fisher. The grandfather was a stanch Churchman, but in later life Dorothy joined the Upper chapel, which at that time was the only place of Dissenting worship. Some of the family remained with their mother, attached to the chapel through the ministry of old Mr. Wadsworth; but the eldest son, John, kept to the parish church; and

William Fisher, his son, the subject of the present sketch, who was born in 1780, was also brought up to Church. When he was a young man, his elder sister, to whom he was much attached, married one of the Favels, a surgeon in the town, a stanch Presbyterian and a vehement Whig, two things which in those days generally went together. An uncle also, with whom he was thrown into close companionship during his apprenticeship, was a firm member of the Upper chapel; and so it came to pass that William Fisher, growing up at the time when the high-handed tyranny of the "Church and King" party disgusted all liberal minds, gradually left the Church and joined the Upper chapel. The minister of the Upper chapel at this time was Mr. Evans, an old man who had occupied the pulpit nearly forty years, with young Mr. Naylor, lately settled as colleague, who presently left and went to Manchester.

From that time, about 1801, to the present day, Mr. Fisher has been one of the most zealous members of the Upper chapel, and an active and leading man in all the affairs of the town, as well as prominent in every struggle for Reform, Education, Free Trade or Religious Liberty.

They were stormy times in which Mr. Fisher's public life began. It is only some ten years since an old man died in the Shrewsbury hospital in Sheffield, who at the beginning of the century was taken up, with many others, on suspicion of manufacturing pikes, and transported for twenty-five years. He lived through his long term of punishment, and when he returned to Sheffield, the influence of Mr. Fisher and others of the old reformers procured him the comfortable almshouse where he ended his days, and where he often used to tell of the "Peep-o'day boys" who drilled at midnight on a common outside the town, and of the panic in Sheffield when almost all the tradesmen in one of the principal streets were taken up on suspicion of Jacobinism. Every reformer in those days was branded as a Jacobin, and became a marked and suspected man; but William Fisher braved suspicion, and even when he was only twenty-one, attended the reform meetings which were held in Paradise Square, for a century past the great place for popular demonstrations. Throughout the thirty years during which the fitful struggle lasted, the people of Sheffield looked on him as one of their ablest leaders. At every great crisis—when the massacre at Peterloo took place, when the French Revolution of 1830 broke out—the crier would be sent round, and in a couple of hours Paradise Square would be crowded to hear what the leading reformers would say. Many remember the consternation which spread like wild-fire through the town when news came in '31 that the Lords had thrown out the Reform Bill, how the church bells rung a dumb peal, and in a little time 25,000 people were wedged into the Square to listen to William Fisher, Samuel Bailey and Thomas Asline Ward, who still survives his old friend, and is the senior Trustee of Upper chapel.

About 1820, the church-rate contest began in Sheffield, and Mr. Fisher threw himself into it with his usual ardour. Meeting after meeting was held in the parish church, and great was the glee of the little knot of reformers who led the opposition, when Luke Palfreyman—another old Upper-chapel name—found out that, by moving the adjournment of the meeting for twelve months, they could avoid the direct negative which the prorate party would have been able to set aside. At last Mr. Fisher made a proposition that the rate should be abandoned, promising himself to give four times the amount that could have been levied on him, and to assist one of the clergy in a canvass for the amount needed to keep the church and churchyard in repair. From that time, church-rates have been only a tradition of the past in Sheffield.

In the movement for Roman Catholic Emancipation in 1829, in the agitation to strengthen the hands of the ministry in bringing forward the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, in the struggle for the repeal of the Corn Laws, and in every movement for popular education, Mr. Fisher took a leading part. In fact, for half a century past, no meeting in Sheffield for any public object has been complete without him; his ardent, fiery courage, his great kindness of disposition, and his hearty, vigorous style of address, making "old William Fisher" a universal favourite with the people.

Of his long connection of sixty years with the Upper chapel, there is not much of any general interest to tell. The life of our old Presbyterian congregations has been for the most part quiet and uneventful. Mr. Fisher and Mr. T. Asline Ward joined the congregation almost together, about 1801, the latter a few months the earlier. Their secession from the Church made considerable stir in the town, especially that of young "Tom Ward," as he was called, then a smart young officer in the Sheffield volunteers. From that time to the present, they have worked together in public matters, and been two of the most active members of the congregation. On the first vacancies in the Trust, they were

appointed Trustees of the chapel. In 1828, towards the close of the late Dr. Philipps' ministry, a secession took place from the Upper chapel. Mr. Fisher, always uncompromising and impetuous, thought that the rights of the congregation were infringed by what he looked upon as the assumption of too great power by the minister, and with several others left the chapel and set up a Unitarian meeting in the Music Hall. It was a hasty, ill-considered step, which many of those who took part in it afterwards regretted; and, after a separation of ten years, the two parties re-united, and from that time there has been complete unanimity of feeling in the congregation.

Mr. Fisher, however, lived to see a separation of a very different kind. When at the close of 1858 a movement was begun for starting a second congregation for St. Philip's district, no one entered with more warmth into the scheme than he did. To the building of the new chapel at Upperthorpe he contributed largely, and one of his last public acts in connection with the congregation was to take part in the laying of the foundation-stone in October, 1860. He spoke that evening at the meeting in the Cutlers' Hall, and was much affected as he alluded to the pleasure he felt in having lived to see a second congregation in the town, and told how he felt that he could not expect to attend many more such meetings of his fellow-worshipers.

In February last, he had a paralytic attack which for a time confined him to the house. He recovered to a wonderful degree, however; and, though his faculty of articulation continued somewhat impaired so that he could no longer take part in any public business, he resumed his visits to the works in Orchard Place, and went about hale, strong and cheerful as ever. He was in his usual place at chapel on Sunday, November 24. On the following Thursday he walked down to business, and seemed as well as ever. During Thursday night, however, he seemed restless and disturbed; and at five o'clock in the morning the doctor was sent for, and arrived just in time to see him peacefully expire.

He was married in 1807 to Miss England, of Robin Hood's Well, near Doncaster, who survives him. He leaves three sons, Alderman William Fisher, Mr. Chas. and Mr. Paul England Fisher, with a daughter, Miss Sarah Fisher. He had lost several children, among whom was Rev. Francis Fisher, Unitarian minister for three years at Dorchester, where he was much beloved, who died in 1846.

Though he had lived an uneventful life, though he occupied no public office, he held a position of general honour and esteem in his native town which will not soon be forgotten. Some years ago, his portrait, painted by Richard Smith, Esq., was placed by public subscription in the Council Hall, where it will look down upon successive generations of public men, a memorial of one of Sheffield's venerable worthies, a large-hearted, able and sagacious Christian citizen.

B. H.

Nov. 27, at Stoke Newington, aged 80, Mrs. Mary Anne Reid, relict of the late Mr. W. H. Reid, of Islington.

The following extract from a short autobiography which she placed in the hands of the minister of Newington-Green chapel about twenty years since, will interest those who knew her long and untiring devotion to that chapel and to the Unitarian cause.

"Until her eighteenth year, Calvinism appeared to her to be the only consistent Christianity. But the mercy of God seemed so totally to forbid the thought of his having formed the bulk of mankind for eternal misery, that at this period she was drawn into Deism as a refuge from that impiety which would make God at once the author and the everlasting punisher of sin. With a heart almost broken by blighted prospects, already weary of this life, and the hope of futurity snatched from her alike by Calvinism and Deism—for if the former were true *she* might not be of the elect, and the latter cut away the ground of reliance upon a future state of existence—an accident led her to hear the late Mr. Belsham at Hackney, and the effect was like the breaking of day after a long and stormy night. 'God is Light' was the text of the first Unitarian sermon she ever heard; and the rational, the delightful views of the paternal character and attributes of God then for the first time set before her, harmonized so exactly with what appeared to be both the scriptural and reasonable representations of the Deity, that from that day she became a constant attendant on Mr. B.'s ministry, and before he removed to Essex Street she had fully embraced his views. Indeed, she found in Unitarianism the religion which she seemed to have been in vain seeking for during all her previous life."

About twenty-two years back, this energetic and almost masculine-minded woman joined the then very small congregation at Newington Green; and from that time until her death the great object for which she lived appeared to be the prosperity of that chapel and its connected institutions. She was the foundress of the Sunday and Day Schools, for many years an active mission-

ary to the poor of the neighbourhood, and for a considerable period a most useful member of the Newington-Green Conversation Society. She lived to see the realization to no small extent of her warmest hopes; but then mortality had begun to lay its strong hand upon her. Her death was so strictly from simple decay of every physical and mental power, that she might be said to have been gradually dying during several previous years. To the last, however, whatever strength of mind she could command was exerted for the interests of the beloved place of worship she was no longer able to attend; to the last she insisted upon contributing *something* from her small pecuniary resources towards the maintenance of the services; and to the last, if anything could bring the light of satisfaction to her features, it was some information conveyed to her of some species of progress at Newington Green. There can be few members of any congregation, in any sect, to whom, in the matter of zeal to serve a religious society and cause, Mary Anne Reid might not be held up as an example, and to whom therefore the injunction might not with propriety be given, to "go and do likewise."

C.

Dec. 4, at Mossley, in the 34th year of her age, HANNAH, the wife of Mr. William Stanley BURTON.

Dec. 6, after a short but severe illness, Mr. ARTHUR PAYNE, second son of Mr. James Payne, of Manchester, and late a student of Manchester New College, London. He was born at Sevenoaks, Kent, Dec. 21, 1840, so that at the time of his death he was within a few days of completing his 21st year. Mr. Payne was originally intended for business; but great activity as a teacher in the Lower Mosley-Street schools, Manchester, brought him into vital contact with the moral and spiritual interests of his fellow-creatures, and awakened in him tastes and aspirations which, strengthened by association with some kindred minds, determined him to embrace the Chistian ministry as the business of his life. With this view he entered Manchester New College as an undergraduate student in the session of 1860-61. He passed through this preliminary part of his academic course with great credit, having at the close of his first session gained the first prize in the Lower Junior Mathematical class, and being bracketed with two others in the second place of honour in the Junior Greek class of University College. His gentle and unassuming manners, assiduous devotion to his studies, and quiet energy of spirit, secured the warm approval of his instructors, with the confidence and affectionate respect of his associates, and bore a rich promise of future usefulness. His tutors and fellow-students accompanied his mortal remains to their last resting-place in the cemetery at Highgate, where they repose amidst many similar memorials of youthful excellences taken early from a world which they seemed destined to improve and bless.

"Thus the righteous that is dead shall condemn the ungodly which are living; and youth that is soon perfected, the many years and old age of the unrighteous."

Dec. 7, ARTHUR JAMES, youngest son of Rev. J. FREESTON, of Failsworth.

Dec. 9, at Hamburg, in his 78th year, LUDWIG STEINTHAL, Esq., formerly of the city of Manchester.

Dec. 24, at Higher Broughton, Manchester, MICHAEL SHIPMAN, Esq., late of Hinckley, in his 82nd year.

MARRIAGES.

Oct. 15, at the church of St. John, Hampstead, by Rev. Thos. Ainger, M.A., ARTHUR FELLOWS, of Victoria, Vancouver's Island, third son of Isaac Fellows, Esq., of Wolverhampton, to ELEANOR CAROLINE, second daughter of Sir Rowland HILL, K.C.B.

Nov. 5, at the Unitarian church, Stourbridge, by Rev. David Maginnis, ALFRED FELLOWS, of Victoria, Vancouver's Island, second son of Isaac Fellows, Esq., of Wolverhampton, to LUCY, daughter of the late John MORGAN, Esq., of Hay, Brecknockshire.

Nov. 20, at the Presbyterian chapel, Newbury, by Rev. Richard Shelley, JOHN ADAMS, of Reading, to EMMA JONES, of Newbury.

Dec. 17, at the Abbey chapel, Tavistock, by Rev. David Griffith, W. A. PALMER, Esq., of Bedford Square, to Miss MARY CARTER, the third daughter of the late Mr. John COMMINS, Abbey Mead, Tavistock.

Dec. 24, at the Unitarian chapel, Belper, by Rev. Rees L. Lloyd, Mr. JOSEPH BURGOYNE, of Belper, to Miss HANNAH PEAT, of the Dalley, near Belper.